

(1.)
JESUS CHRIST

James THE *Patterson*

MEDIATOR

BETWEEN

GOD and MAN,

AN

ADVOCATE for us with the FATHER,
and a Propitiation for the Sins of
the World.

The THIRD EDITION.

To which is now added, by another Gentleman,
An ESSAY to prove the Credibility
of the GOSPEL, from the Doctrine of
the Efficacy of CHRIST's Death for
the Redemption of the World.

D U B L I N:

Printed for H. BRADLEY, at the *King's-Arms*, and
Two Bibles in *Dame-street*. M DCC LXIV.

T. PATTERSON





THE
P R E F A C E.



EN are generally willing to know what they may expect to find in a Book, before they give themselves the Trouble of reading it. And I think it is but just, that every Writer should be willing to gratify this so reasonable a Desire, as far as he can.

I design'd that the Title-page should give an Expectation of a merely *Scriptural Account* of the Matters there propos'd. But for farther Satisfaction, I here give a more particular Account of the following Treatise; and leave the Reader to proceed or lay it aside, as he shall think fit.

My Design was purely, to examine what the Scriptures declare, concerning *God's reconciling the World unto himself by Jesus Christ*. For this Purpose I have collected the most material Passages which shew us what Christ was to do by the Appointment of the Father, in Order to the bringing about this Reconciliation; and have endeavour'd to state the true genuine Sense of those Scriptures.

From what is there presented to our View, I form my Notion of this Dispensation of God towards Men: Wherein I don't know that I have been in the least byass'd or influenc'd by any particular Schemes or Notions of Men of any Sect or Party whatsoever. What I offer is the genuine Result of my own Thoughts, upon the View I had taken of what the Scriptures declare to us concerning these Matters.

I have cited a few Passages from Dr. *Clarke*, some of which I met with after I had drawn up what I here present to the Reader. All the World will allow that Dr. *Clarke* was a Man of a clear Head and strong Reason, though they
may

The P R E F A C E. v

may not fall in with all his Notions. I thought therefore that the Judgment of that great Man, might fairly be set as a Balance to the Opinion of those, who have represented the Doctrine of *Satisfaction*, as being attended with many gross Absurdities; which may perhaps prejudice some Persons against it, before they have duly examin'd it themselves.

And whereas, that which I apprehend to be plainly the Doctrine of the New Testament, hath been by some made an Objection against the Gospel as a divine Revelation; and hath been in a Manner given up by others who have professed the Christian Religion, as if it were not agreeable to Reason; I thought myself oblig'd to consider the Objections made against it, and have endeavoured to clear it of the Absurdities with which some would load it; (particularly Mr. Chubb in a late Pamphlet, entitled *a Discourse concerning Reason with regard to Religion and divine Revelation*,) and on the contrary have attempted to shew the Wisdom of this Dispensation, and to make it appear to be every way worthy of God.

I then by way of Conclusion, add some few Considerations with Respect to the Importance of Men's receiving the Doctrine of our Redemption by Jesus Christ, as it is set forth in the New Testament. Some Things that I have offer'd upon this Occasion are indeed of larger Extent, and may serve for a general Caution against a rash rejecting of any Doctrine of Revelation. The intemperate Zeal of some Bigots in making their own particular Notions and Interpretations of Scripture (sometimes their particular Phrases) Fundamentals of Christianity, hath been justly condemn'd and exploded by considerate Men of all Perswasions. There may be an Extreme on the other hand. With some Persons it seems to be an indifferent Thing what Notions Men embrace in Matters of Religion, provided they do not affect Morality: This may be a dangerous Mistake. And the more there is of a Zeal for Liberty and a just Indignation against the rash Censuring of others for difference of Opinion, the more need there may be of Caution in this Respect. I have endeavour'd

deavour'd to set that Matter in a just and fair Light. Let not any one say, " what I propose to the Adversaries of " the Doctrines I defend, may *mutatis* " *mutandis* be retorted upon myself." Be it so; what follows from thence? Surely, not that such Considerations are not fit to be propos'd; but rather, that they are such as ought to be attended to by all Parties and all Persons without Exception.

Possibly some will think I have been too prolix; particularly in citing so many Texts of Scripture. But I would desire the Reader, whoever he be, to have Patience in reading those Scriptures, tho' he may be acquainted with them, and upon that Account it may seem tedious; and especially to consider what is offer'd for the establishing the *literal* Sense of them. I am apt to think that Christians cannot easily give up the plain Doctrine of the Gospel concerning our *Redemption by the Blood of Christ*, either to the Objections that are pretended to be brought from Reason, or to the forced Constructions that are put upon some Passages of Scripture; while they
have

have as it were in one View before them the many express Declarations of the Word of God relating to this Subject.

I am sensible that a Discourse which is not long may be tedious. And it's likely some will say, I might have been more concise in other Parts of this Discourse, I shall not attempt to make an Apology, by observing that there is somewhat natural in every Man's particular way of writing; and therefore we should bear with some Things, tho' not altogether so agreeable in the Manner of writing; provided the Matter as to the main of it be worth regarding. Much less shall I presume to excuse this by suggesting, that there have been Writers of considerable Note who have been indulg'd in this Way: I may expect it will be replied, "the Weight and Value of their Thoughts compensated for their being tedious, if they appeared so in the Way of conveying their Thoughts." The principal Thing I have to offer, is, that I design'd what I wrote for the Benefit of common Christians; and not only for the nice and curious. Some there are who have not been much exercised

exercis'd in reading or thinking, who yet affect to be Followers of those who are reputed Men of Reason and Thought, and are apt enough to catch at Objections, and to fall in with the Dislike of receiv'd Opinions: This gives them an Air of being distinguish'd from the Vulgar. Some at least who may have been prejudic'd against this Part of Revelation, may *need* more Words and a more diffuse way of Writing. It is hop'd therefore that others will bear with it, tho' a more concise Manner might have been more agreeable to them.

If any shall think that I bear too hard upon those who are for putting a *figurative Sense* upon the several Scriptures which speak of Christ's being a Sacrifice, and a Priest, &c. and particularly upon those who would make the arguing in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* to be merely an *Accommodation* to the Principles and Notions receiv'd among them; I desire it may be consider'd, it can be no Injury to any Person to shew the Consequences of his Opinion: This certainly must be allow'd to be one proper Way of confuting an Error. If indeed
a Writer

a Writer shall exaggerate Consequences beyond what he himself believes; this were to act unfairly. Tho' generally speaking no Man can pretend to accuse another of this; it must be left to the Writer's own Conscience; and if that accuses him, it may be Punishment enough. But I say, unless the Person whose Opinion is opposed can make out this, 'tis impertinent to make Complaints; his Business is to shew, either that the Consequences do not follow, or else that they may be allow'd and justified.

I have only taken a Liberty which I should willingly allow to any other, and which I think every Man hath a Right to; *i. e.* to give his free Thoughts in a Matter that appears to him to be of Importance in the Christian Religion.

I would here advertise the Reader, that the Remarks he will meet with upon some Passages relating to this Subject in Mr. *Foster's* late Treatise of the *Usefulness, Truth, and Excellency of the Christian Religion*, were made upon my reading the first Edition of that Book.

Mr.

Mr. *Foster* hath since † publish'd a *Postscript* for the farther explaining and illustrating this Subject, with Reference to which he says, *those who had excepted against what he had offer'd, had generally misunderstood him.* It was not from any Ambition of opposing or censuring that ingenious Writer, that I made those Remarks; but only because in those Passages he appear'd to me, as well as to many others, to give a Representation different from the Scripture Account of Things, which I was endeavouring to set in a true Light. As those Animadversions have given me occasion to enlarge upon some Particulars, which may contribute to the giving us a more full and distinct View of the Matters I was treating of, I thought it would be no Injury to Mr. *Foster* to let them stand; provided I should take care to refer the Reader to his *Postscript*, where any Thing which I have taken notice of hath been farther explain'd, which accordingly I have done. I would be far from

† My Treatise was finish'd and transcrib'd before Mr. *Foster* had publish'd his *Postscript*; at least before I had seen it.

doing any Thing that might seem to reflect upon so valuable a Writer, or that might have the least Tendency to prevent the Usefulness of his excellent Treatise in Defence of Christianity; for which he hath my hearty Thanks.

When I had finish'd these Papers, I put them into the Hand of a learned and ingenious Friend, desiring the Favour of his Remarks; particularly, where he met with any thing that might be liable to Exception. Where Truth is the sole Aim and Pursuit, a Man is willing to hear what may be said on one side as well as the other: In justice therefore to the Reader and to Truth, I have given the Remarks my Friend was pleased to favour me with in the Margin; and have added what I thought might farther help to clear up Matters.

If what I have wrote shall prove the whole to be of Service for the clearing up the Truth; or may give Satisfaction to any one who is disposed to receive the Doctrine of the Gospel, I have my End.



J E S U S



JESUS CHRIST

T H E

MEDIATOR between God and Man, an
ADVOCATE for us with the Father,
and a PROPITIATION for the Sins of
the World.



VERY Man who believes a God
must of Consequence reckon it his
highest Concern to secure the Di-
vine Favour and Acceptance: And
as this is the most important Affair
that a Man can be concern'd about,
since happiness absolutely depends upon it, 'tis
surely not only allowable, but highly commenda-
ble, to examine well whatever may be propos'd or
recommended as a Means of obtaining this great
End. All Religion pretends to this; I mean, to di-
rect us how we may secure the Favour of God.
Many Pretences of this Nature have been so mani-
festly absurd, one would wonder that ever any such
Things should enter into the Mind of a reasonable
B Creature

Creature; yet Men have given into them, and expected Benefit by them. Not only many vain and ridiculous Superstitions, but filthy and abominable, wicked and cruel Practices have been made Acts of Religion, and recommended under the Notion of Divine Institutions, and have accordingly been observed as Means of obtaining Blessings from Heaven. When we see how easily many have been, and are to this Day, led away with such strange and unaccountable Delusions; it carries a Conviction even to Sense, that no Man is to be blam'd for examining into the Nature and Grounds of a Religion propos'd to him before he embraces it.

I am therefore far from thinking it any Reproach to the present Age, that Men are become more inquisitive about the Principles and Practices of Religion than perhaps in some former Times. And as Reveal'd Religion doth necessarily pre-suppose Natural Religion; since 'tis impossible we should judge of a Revelation, or so much as have the Notion of being oblig'd to pay any Regard to it, but upon previous Principles of Natural Religion; so it must be allow'd an unanswerable Objection to any pretence of Revelation, if it can be made appear that it proposes a Doctrine absurd in itself, or inconsistent with those Attributes and Perfections of the Deity, which the Light of Nature manifests to us.

But may there not be a too hasty, a rash and precipitate Conclusion and Judgment concerning Matters contained in a Divine Revelation, as well as on the other hand too easy Credulity in admitting Pretences to a Revelation? Are there some Persons ready to swallow every Thing that comes to them with the Name and Appearance of Divine Authority?

Authority? May there not be others who give in too much to Prejudice, and too hastily take upon them to determine concerning the Divine Dispensations; concluding some Things absolutely unfit and unbecoming the Supreme Being, when perhaps they cannot be proper Judges at all in the Case, the Reason of God's Proceedings lying entirely out of their Reach; or passing Sentence before they have well consider'd the Case in all its Circumstances, according to the Views we might have in our present State upon a just Consideration of Matters?

The Doctrine of a Mediator between God and Men is a Matter of pure Revelation: The New Testament is express, *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*, 1 Tim. ii. 5. That this Mediator *gave himself a Ransom for us, offered himself a Sacrifice*, and is the *Propitiation for the Sins of the World*; these are also express Declarations of the sacred Writers (1 Tim. ii. 6. Epistle to the *Hebrews*, 1 John ii. 2.) yet it's well known these Doctrines have been accounted by some Persons absurd in themselves, and utterly inconsistent with the Notions we have by the Light of Nature concerning God and the Divine Government; and being so apprehended have been made Objections against the Christian Revelation. Some others, who are convinc'd of the Truth of the Gospel, and allow the Divine Authority of the New Testament, have not been willing to admit these Doctrines in the plain *literal* Sense, as they have been generally understood by Christians in all Ages. These Persons cannot withstand the abundant Proof that Christ and his Apostles gave of a Divine Commission; but because the Notion of Christ's being a real Sacrifice, and in a proper literal Sense, a Propitiation for Sin seems to them unreasonable,

they do, as some judge, in effect explain away these Doctrines; making the most direct and plain, and strong Expressions, and positive Assertions, to intend no more than bare *Allusions* and *Accommodations*, or to be at most but *Condescensions* to the Ways of thinking which then obtain'd among Men, and especially among the *Jews*.

It hath been with some Concern that I have seen and heard sometimes such forced Explications; such strange Turns given to several Passages of sacred Writ, as do, in my Apprehension, tend to make Revelation of very little use, and which indeed, if equally pursu'd through all Points, would make it stand for just nothing. I am one of those who take the Doctrine of *Christ's Mediation* to be a main and principal Part of the Revelation which God in his great Mercy hath favoured us with. And as the receiving this Doctrine, and submitting to it as it is revealed in the Gospel, appears to me to be of great Importance to them to whom it is made known; I presume no one will be offended at my attempting to clear the Doctrine from the Objections that have been urg'd against it; by which some may have been prejudic'd against the Gospel itself, as plainly containing the Doctrine of Christ's being a Propitiation, &c. and to remove the Prejudices of others who seem to set aside the Mediation of Christ, as set forth and described in the New Testament, while at the same Time they do receive the New Testament as a Divine Revelation.

But I would first lay before the Reader the *Declarations of Scripture*, citing some of the principal Passages which relate to the Mediation of Christ. When we have seen what the Scripture says of these Matters, I shall endeavour to give an *Account of our Redemption by Christ, consistent with the Dictates of Reason*

Reason and Natural Religion. Then I would consider the *Objections* that have been made against this Doctrine of the New Testament; particularly what hath been urged by Mr. *Chubb* against making Satisfaction for Sin, in his late Pamphlet, entitled, *A Discourse concerning Reason with regard to Religion and Divine Revelation.* Having thus clear'd the Way, I shall then attempt to give some View of the *Wisdom* of this Dispensation; and by way of Conclusion, offer a few Things touching the *Importance* ^a of receiving the Doctrine of our Redemption by Jesus Christ, as it is set forth in the New Testament.

C H A P.

^a Some Persons it may be, will scarce bear to hear of the *Importance* of a Doctrine of Revelation, which may be thought only to be a Matter of Speculation. But I would observe, that the Doctrine of Christ's Mediation, as set forth in the New Testament, is not a Matter of mere Speculation. However, it hath been represented as a considerable Objection against the Importance of this Doctrine of our Redemption by the Blood of Christ. "That it is never explicitly mention'd in the *As.*" I have endeavoured to account for the little Notice taken of it in the first preaching of the Apostles recorded in the *As.* But indeed the Importance I intend, is the Importance of receiving the Doctrine when plainly revealed; not that it is necessary to be known in order to Salvation. It's plain, I think, that the Apostles themselves had little or no Apprehension of it till after Christ's Resurrection. But when it is plainly made known, Persons are certainly answerable for rejecting this Doctrine, as they are who reject the Gospel when duly proposed.

It hath been further suggested, "That in the *Epistles* it seems principally introduc'd for the adjusting some Matters which came early to be disputed among contentious, weak Christians; particularly, it is urged to satisfy a certain Set of Christians (who at that Time needed such Satisfaction) that they might as reasonably

C H A P. I.

A Collection of several Passages of Scripture concerning our Redemption by Christ. The literal Sense established. The Death of Christ a real Sacrifice. Christ a proper Priest.

TH E first Thing I propose, is to present at one View to the Reader, some of the express Declarations of Scripture relating to the Mediation of Christ; I mean, his mediating with God on our behalf; for this it is which some Persons cannot digest. The Scripture expressly gives Christ the Title of MEDIATOR [the one Mediator;] this they are willing to allow, understanding it of his mediating on the part of God towards us, *i. e.* Jesus Christ is invested in a Mediatorial Kingdom, and so dispenses the Favours of God to Men. This, in my Judgment, is but one half of what the Scripture designs when it calls Christ the Mediator; I

ably and certainly by the Christian Institution expect and obtain the Remission of all their Sins, as the *Jews* could under their Dispensation hope for Pardon of their ceremonial or political Guilt, when they had offered the Sacrifices in those cases provided and appointed." But when I observe in what Manner our Redemption by the Blood of Christ is spoken of, not only in the Epistles of *Paul*, but of *Peter* and *John*, and I may add, by the whole Church in the *Book of the Revelation*, I can by no means come into that Thought. It seems plainly to me to be the current Doctrine of the Gospel. Indeed we have no where so full Explication of Christ's priestly Office as in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; perhaps it was not convenient to give a complete View of that till the Dissolution of the *Jewish* State was nigh at hand. This we may have farther occasion to take notice of hereafter.

suppose

suppose it to include what he doth, or hath done, on our behalf towards God. The Apostle, I think, had plainly most direct Respect to this, when he tells us, *There is one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*; for he adds, *Who gave himself a Ransom for us*. If it appears that Christ offered himself a Sacrifice; that he makes Intercession for us; that he is ordained for us an High-priest in Things pertaining to God; and that we are required to come unto God by him under this Character; if these, and the like, are in the plain literal Sense the Doctrines of the New Testament, I suppose none will make it matter of Dispute, whether the Title of *Mediator* hath not respect to these Things, as well as to his acting on the behalf of God towards us; not to observe that the very Term seems to imply a transacting with each Party on the Behalf of the other, according to that of the Apostle, *A Mediator is not of one*.

But not to insist on this, which may perhaps be thought to be no more than a Dispute about the Signification of a Word; what I propose, is, to lay before the Reader the Declarations of Scripture with relation to these Matters; I mean particularly, what was appointed for Christ to do on our behalf, and consequently what he hath done, or now does for us, in order to our Reconciliation with God. These Declarations are indeed so plain and express that they seldom need any Comment; but those who do receive the Revelation, and yet like not these Doctrines which we take to be contain'd therein, must be suppos'd to give some Turn to those Expressions, and some way or other to account for them; it may be requisite therefore to take some Notice of what may have been suggested in order to evade the plain, obvious, literal Sense of these Declarations of Scripture.

The first Passage of Scripture I shall mention, is the famous Prophecy of Christ's Sufferings in the liii Chapter of *Isaiab*. The *Jews* have made some weak Attempts to apply that Prophecy to some other Person than the *Messiah*; but what the Prophet says of the Cause, of the End and the Design of the Sufferings of the Person there referr'd to, be the Person who he will, is, methinks, as plain as can be express'd in Language: *He was wounded for our Transgressions, he was bruised for our Iniquities: The Chastisement of our Peace was upon him, and with his Stripes we are healed—All we like Sheep have gone astray:—And the Lord hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all—He was cut off out of the Land of the Living; for the Transgression of my People was he stricken—He had done no Violence, neither was Guile found in his Mouth; yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him, he hath put him to Grief: When thou shalt make his Soul an Offering for Sin he shall see his Seed—By his Knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their Iniquities—He was number'd with the Transgressors; and he bare the Sin of many, and made Intercession for the Transgressors* ^b. That known Prophecy of the

^b It is supposed some may object, " That these Expressions do not necessarily, and considering the Genius of the Language, do not naturally, signify any more than this, *None of those Evils of Contempt, Pain and Death would have befallen this Son and sent of God if we had not sinned—* He was wounded for our Transgressions, &c. i. e. *He had never been wounded or become liable to any Grief or Sorrow, if we had not transgressed.*" I might very well leave the Expressions, if any one will but take them together, to speak for themselves. I shall only desire the Reader, to observe, that what is here declared is assign'd by the Prophet as the Cause or Reason of this Person's Suffering, in direct Opposition

the *Seventy Weeks* in *Daniel* speaks to the same Purpose, Chap. ix. 24. *Seventy Weeks* are determined upon thy People, and upon thy holy City to finish the Transgressions, and to make an end of Sins, and to make Reconciliation for Iniquity, and to bring in everlasting Righteousness—Messiah shall be cut off, but not for himself. This was the Account God himself was pleased to give before-hand of the Sufferings of Christ.

Proceed we to the New Testament : *When* John Baptist seeth Jesus coming unto him, he saith, *Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the Sin of the World*, John i. 29. The *Jews*, it is true, at that Time seem to have drop'd the Notion of the Messiah's Suffering ; bur our Business is, to enquire what we may rationally conceive to be the true Meaning of this Declaration of the Baptist. I don't remem-

Opposition to what the Spectators were ready to surmise : They would be ready to conclude, that those Evils were inflicted on him for some great Wickedness of his own ; *We esteemed him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted*. But the Prophets gives them to understand that it was not such Thing ; on the contrary he tells them, that it was for our Transgressions that he was wounded ; that the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him ; that it was because God had laid upon him the Iniquity of us all.

To strengthen that general Sense of the Expressions which was suggested above, it is observ'd, " That we frequently say concerning this or the other Calamity of Life ; *Sin is the Cause of this and all our Sorrow ; this comes on us for Sin ; though we have no reason to regard this Trouble as befalling us as any proper Punishment or any Token of the Divine Displeasure against us for any particular Sin.*" But I think, according to that general Saying, those Evils are considered as *Punishments of Sin*, though we can't say that this or that particular Sin hath been the Cause of such particular Evil,

ber any other Place in the Old Testament where Christ is compared to a *Lamb*, besides that in the liii^d Chapter of *Isaiab*; and it must be owned, the Comparison there hath most direct and immediate respect to his Meekness in bearing the Sufferings which were inflicted upon him. But surely no Man can look into that Chapter, which describes him suffering, without seeing at the same Time, what was the Cause, what the End and Design of the Messiah's Suffering; and in a Word, in what Manner, and by what Means, he was to *take away the Sin of the World*; namely, by suffering himself for the Sins of Men.

We might observe upon this Occasion, that the continual Sacrifice at the Temple Morning and Evening was a *Lamb*; and that the Paschal Feast was celebrated yearly by offering a *Lamb*, which every Family was to partake of; and this was called the Lord's Passover. These Considerations might lead the *Jews* very naturally, if they had any Notion of the Messiah's Suffering, as represented in the Prophecy of *Isaiab*, to understand the *Baptist* of Christ's dying as a Sacrifice for Sin; and truly one would think they could not easily put any other Sense upon the Words; I mean, that they should have any other Notion of a *Lamb's taking away Sin*.

But leaving it to every one to judge as he pleases; in what Sense the *Jews* might take those Words, I think we have reason to believe, that the Apostle *Peter* understood them in the Sense we have given; if not at the Time when the *Baptist* made that Declaration to the People, yet afterwards, when he wrote his first Epistle: There we find him making use of the same Representation, which it's likely he might take from this very saying of the *Baptist*;

Baptist; possibly *Peter* himself heard *John* speak these Words; or however we may suppose that his Brother *Andrew* gave him an Account of what *John* had said, *John* i. 40. Now the Notion he gives us of Christ under this Representation, is plainly that of a Sacrifice. *Ye know*, says he, *that ye were redeemed not with corruptible Things, as Silver and Gold, but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without blemish and without spot*, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. The same Representation we find carried on, if I may so express it, into the heavenly State. Thus in the Book of *Revelation*, Chap. v. ver. 6. *I beheld, and lo in the midst of the Throne—stood a Lamb as it had been slain*. Under this Character he frequently receives the Adorations of the blessed, *They fell down before the Lamb—saying, Thou art worthy—for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy Blood—Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power—*—And again we read of the Saints having *washed their Garments and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb*, Chap. vii. 14. c.

c Whereas I seem to represent, “the Terms *Slain*, “*Death*, *Blood*, &c. as directing our Thoughts to some “peculiar Efficacy there is in Christ’s *dying* more than in “any or all the other Parts of his Ministry for the Salvation “of Men:” It hath been suggested, “That where- “ever these Terms occur, they may be supposed to “stand by an easy and frequent Figure as a Part for the “whole, and are always plainly design’d to include all “that Christ did, as well as suffer’d, during his Incar- “nation, Humiliation or Ministry. As every Addition “to Happiness is summed up in the Term *Life*, so every “Diminution or Abatement of Happiness, Enjoyment “and Glory, may not improperly be represented under “the Notion of *Death*. The one is the greatest Good, “the other, in human Apprehension and Estimate, the “forest Evil.” With respect to the making Attonement the Scripture doth manifestly lay peculiar Strefs upon
Christ’s

I might add as a farther Confirmation of the Sense we have given to this solemn publick Declaration of the *Baptist* at his first manifesting Christ to the People, that the Phrase, *Take away Sin*, is commonly us'd to denote the taking away Guilt, and hath respect to past Sins: This I believe will be found to be constantly the Sense, when it is spoken of as the Effect of a Sacrifice, as in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. And when there is no immediate Reference to a Sacrifice, this Expression in the

Christ's DYING or *shedding his Blood*. Not to mention the several Passages in the Prophecies and Evangelists, and Epistles, which will occur in the ensuing Discourse; I shall only observe here, that throughout the whole *Epistle to the Hebrews*, our Redemption by Christ is represented as being in a particular manner the Effect or Consequence of his dying or shedding his Blood. *As the Children were partakers of Flesh and Blood, so he himself also took part of the same, that THROUGH DEATH he might destroy him, &c.* Under the Law the Blood is expressly said to be given to make Atonement, because therein is the Life: Accordingly, as that *Writer* observes. *The High Priest enter'd into the Holiest not without Blood, which he offered—but Christ being come—not by the Blood of Bulls, &c. but by his own Blood he enter'd—having obtained eternal Redemption for us.* He goes on, *If the Blood of Bulls, &c. sanctified—how much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offer'd himself. purge your Consciences. For this Cause he was made the Mediator of a new Covenant, that by means of Death for the Redemption of the Transgressions—* *ἵνα θανάτῳ γενομένης εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν* — And in what Sense soever we understand the following Words, *ὅτι γὰρ διέθνη* — it's plain the Stress is laid upon his dying; *There must of necessity be the Death τοῦ διέθνητος*. If *διέθνη* there be understood of a Covenant which God makes with sinful Creatures (*Vide Pierce in loc*) what can be more express to our purpose? It would be tedious to transcribe any more.

Old

Old Testament, in many places, evidently carries this Sense; see particularly, *Hof. xiv. 2. Take with you Words, turn unto the Lord, say unto him, Take away all Iniquity, and receive us graciously.* Upon the whole, I think Christians have abundant Reason to take these Words of the *Baptist* as manifesting Jesus to the People under the Character of one appointed of God to be a *Sacrifice* for the Sins of the World; answering to the Account which had been given of the Messiah by the Prophet *Isaiab.*

But it's Time to pass on to some other Passages in the New Testament. Our Lord seems to have been more sparing in instructing his Disciples concerning the Nature of his *priestly Office*^d, before his Death;

^d It is observ'd, "That there is no Intimation in all Christ's Ministry on Earth that he took himself to be a Priest, or that he desired others should take and own him for one; he laid claim frequently to a Commission from God to teach, to rule, to judge the Children of Men: Not once doth he assert that he had any Commission to officiate as a *Priest*, or to offer any Sacrifice to expiate or make Atonement for the Sins of Men. And on the Supposition that he was to act as truly and properly, and literally, as a *Priest* at his Death, as he did as a *Prophet* before his Death, and doth now as a *King* since his Resurrection; why should the two other Characters be so expressly and repeatedly claimed; and *this* he never, or so very obscurely, if at all hinted?" But doth not the *Writer to the Hebrews*, speak of it, and prove it from the Old Testament? Suppose we could see no Reason why Christ during his Ministry here on Earth should make no mention of it; would that make void the repeated Assertion of the *Writer to the Hebrews*, or the solemn Declaration of God in the *cxth Psalm*? By the way

Death; possibly this might be among the Things which as yet *they were not able to bear*. While he conversed with Men on Earth, his chief Work seems to have been, to teach them their proper Duty towards God and towards one another, as the great Prophet who was to come into the World. But as he told them many Times that he was to suffer Death, so we have some Declarations from himself of the Design of his Death. I do not insist on his saying, that he must *lay down his Life for the Sheep*;

way I may observe, that our Saviour himself refers the *Jews* to that very *Psalms* as a Prophecy of him, though he did not expressly take notice of that Passage which speaks of his being a Priest. I think the *Epistle to the Hebrews* and the *cxth Psalm*, sufficient Authority for the asserting the *priestly Office* of Christ. But possibly some Account may be given of our Saviour's taking so little notice of this; He was not to officiate as Priest on Earth; at least his acting as Priest could not be completed but by his entering into Heaven; nor was there required any special regard to him under that Character till then. It is observable, that he doth not so much as direct his Disciples to *ask in his Name*, till just before his leaving the World; and this was to be done by them after that he should go to the Father. Then might it be Time enough to let them into a distinct Knowledge of this part of his Undertaking. Perhaps the *Disciples* themselves were not able to bear it, *vide John xvi. 12.* and it might not be proper to speak of it to the *Jews*. Certainly if the *Jews* had then had as clear Understanding of the *liii^d Chapter of Isaiah*, as Christians now have; they would never have put it in Execution. Saint Paul says, that *the People and their Rulers not knowing him, nor yet the Voices of the Prophets which were read every Sabbath Day; fulfilled them in condemning him, Acts xiii. 27.* And Peter to the same purpose, *Acts iii. 17, 18.* it was necessary that Christ should assert his Commission from God to teach; His claiming a Kingdom would

Sheep; nor on his telling *Nicodemus*, that as *Moses* lifted up the *Serpent* in the *Wilderness*; so the *Son of Man* must be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting *Life*; nor on what he says, of giving his *Flesh* for the *Life* of the *World*^e, because there is no direct mention of his dying

would not interfere with their fulfilling the Prophecies it rather did promote it; and on the other hand was a proper Motive to such as really believed on him: But a particular Explication of his *priestly Office*, such as is given us by the *Writer to the Hebrews*, would certainly, if rightly apprehended and believed by the *Jews*, have prevented the Accomplishment in the Way it was design'd; and his claiming the Priesthood, if not rightly understood, might have given them a Pretence of Accusation, which perhaps it was not fit they should have against him. It seems as if the *believing Jews* were not able to bear this Point in its full Light, for a considerable Time after that they had embraced Christianity; for this Reason, perhaps, it was deferr'd till very near the Dissolution of their State: for as the *Writer to the Hebrews* shews, Christ's Priesthood did set aside their whole Constitution, which they had so great Veneration for, *Heb. vii. 12.* Yet let me add, that as to the Things performed by Christ and obtain'd by him as our Priest, and a dependance upon him for such Things, and Acknowledgments to him upon these Accounts; these were soon spoken of, and known among Christians by the Preaching of the Gospel after Christ's Resurrection; and he had given some Hints of them in his own Doctrine.

^e There are some Passages in the Book of *Proverbs* which represent the Doctrines and Precepts of Wisdom under the Figure of rich Provisions for eating and drinking; and some Passages in the *Apocryphal Writers* that speak of feeding upon Wisdom, and the like: These may serve to illustrate eating and drinking in a *Spiritual Sense*. But was there ever any Instance brought of a *living Person* who represented the communicating his Doctrine to the
World

dying for Sin, or dying as a Sacrifice. But what can be more expresse to this purpose, than those Words of Christ at the Institution of the Supper, *This is my Body which is given for you*, or as St. Paul hath it, *which is broken for you; this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the Remission of Sins*. To which we may add, what he had declared before this, *The Son of Man came not to be minister'd unto, but to minister, and to give his Life a Ransom for many*, Matt. xx. 28. Neither ought we to overlook his directing the Disciples to come by him as Mediator when they made their Addresses to God; *Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my Name, he will give it you. Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my Name; ask, and ye shall receive, that your Joy may be full*, John xvi. 23. This Christians have generally understood to imply the expecting that God would grant their Petitions for his sake. And indeed what more natural Sense of the Words, than that they should make use of his Name in their Applications to God for his Favour and Blessing? This the Disciples

World under the Figure of *giving his own Flesh for the Life of the World*; or Men's believing and receiving his Doctrine under the Figure of *eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood*? I never met with any Thing parallel, or that had any manner of resemblance. I must own therefore, I have always thought it strange that Christians who have read of Christ's giving his *Body to be broken for us*, and his *Blood to be shed for the Remission of our Sins*, and that he came to give his *Life a Ransom for us*, that any I say, who know these Things, should chuse to understand that Discourse of our Lord in the sixth Chapter of *John* merely of his *Doctrine*; whereas the Reference to his salutary Passion in those Expressions is plain and easy, and natural, but such Expressions, if refer'd only to his Doctrine, must appear to be very odd, and altogether unnatural, and, as I said before, without any parallel Instance to support them.

had

had not done as yet, not being before this instructed so to do. Nor do those Words of our Saviour which follow afterwards, *I say not unto you, that I will pray the Father for you*, in the least interfere with this Sense of their asking in his Name. Were it so, that those words had denied any Intercession of Christ on their behalf, it might still be requir'd upon account of what he had done, that they should always come in his Name, and expect to be heard for his sake. But doth our Saviour say, *I will not pray the Father for you*? No; but, *I do not say that I will pray*——Who doth not see the Difference? And the Meaning plainly is no other than this, “Ask in my Name, and though you
 “ may certainly depend upon my good Offices;
 “ yet not to insist on this, not to mention this, I
 “ tell you for your Encouragement, the Father
 “ himself hath a particular Kindness for you.
 “ That Regard you have shown to me doth of it-
 “ self dispose and incline the Father to shew a fa-
 “ vourable Regard to you in all your Addresses to
 “ him.” The manner of Expression, *I say not that I will pray*——is but a more engaging and more emphatical Way of introducing that other Encouragement he was going to mention, *q. d.*
 “ I need not tell you that I will pray the Father;
 “ this you may suppose, and will of Course expect,
 “ when I bid you ask in my Name: But besides
 “ this, I tell you that the Father himself loveth
 “ you; so that if it might be suppos'd that I
 “ should neglect you; you have sufficient ground
 “ to expect that the Father will take Notice of
 “ you, and grant your Requests.” That it cannot intend to deny Christ's interceding on our behalf, is evident from other express Declarations of Scripture. Not to observe that Christ himself had told them in express Words, *I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter*, Chap. xiv. 16.

That

That St. *John*, the Writer of this Gospel, did not so understand Christ is undeniable; for he tells us long after this, that *Jesus Christ is an Advocate for us with the Father*, in his first Epistle, Chap. ii. 2.

We proceed now to the *Apostles* who were sent forth with a Commission from Christ to preach the Gospel to the World. Let us see what they taught concerning Christ's Mediation (I mean in that respect in which we have propos'd to consider it) after that he was risen from the dead, and when they had received the Spirit to lead them into all Truth. Some have wonder'd that we should find no more Notice taken of these Points of Christian Doctrine, [Christ's Sacrifice and Propitiation, his priestly Office, &c.] in the Account we have of their Preaching Christ in the *Book of the Acts*. But if we find that the Apostles taught them at any Time, we may, I hope, depend upon them as genuine Doctrines of Christianity; though we could not account for their silence about them in those Discourses which are recorded in that Book. If *Peter*, suppose, or *Paul* mentioned nothing of Christ's *Dying for our Sins*, and *making Intercession for us*, in the first Sermon one or the other preached to this or that People; will this be sufficient Ground for the putting a forc'd Sense upon the plainest Declaration of these Things in their after Writings? Or, because they did not think it necessary to insist on these Points in every Discourse they made concerning Christ; may we conclude that it is of no Importance to believe these Doctrines, when in other Discourses they do in most express Words assert these Things?

But we are to consider that the great Design of those Discourses we have of the Apostles in the *Book of the Acts*, was to convince the People that *Jesus*
was

was the Messiah: This was naturally their first Business; this was evidently the main, I may say, in a manner, the only Point they had in view in their first preaching Christ. Afterwards, no doubt, they did more fully and particularly instruct them in what belong'd to the Office of the *Messiah*, and what he did for them under that Character. Accordingly we find, when St. *Paul* speaks to the Elders of *Ephesus*, among whom he had preached for a considerable Time, he mentions Christ's having *purchased the Church with his own Blood*, and speaks of it as a Thing they were well acquainted with, *Acts* xx. 28.

I might take Notice of some Hints of these Matters though not so particularly insisted on, or fully explained, as some perhaps would expect, in some of their first Discourses, *e. g.* When St. *Paul* tells the *Jews* in the Synagogue at *Antioch*, *Through this Man is preached to you Forgiveness of Sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all Things, from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses*, Chap. xiii. 38, 39. How were they justified from any Thing under the Law of *Moses*; was it not by way of Atonement? Was not this therefore a Hint to them, that here was an Atonement of greater Efficacy? But I insist not on this; nor on *Philip's* preaching Jesus to the Eunuch from that Passage in the liii. Chapter of *Isaiab*, which the Eunuch was then reading: Upon which occasion it is scarcely to be conceiv'd how *Philip* could well avoid taking notice of Christ's having suffer'd for our Sins. But since the Writer hath not given us a particular Account of *Philip's* Discourse, we don't pretend to build any Thing upon it. But this I say, as was hinted above, allowing that the Apostles took no notice of Christ's dying for our Sins, making Atonement by his Blood, being an Advocate for
us,

us, &c. in their Discourses recorded in the *Book of the Acts*; if they afterwards declare these Things in their Writings, I hope they are not for that Reason the less to be credited, or the Things themselves upon that account the less intelligible when plainly express'd. And now whether they are not plainly and expressly asserted in those Writings which the *Apostles* themselves have left us, I shall leave to every Man to judge upon perusing the Passages I shall set before him.

Let us look into the *Epistles*: I shall take them in their Order as they are plac'd in our Bibles. St. Paul, in his *Epistle to the Romans*, is professedly treating of the Way wherein guilty Creatures are restor'd to Favour and Acceptance with God. Having prov'd, that the whole World was become guilty before God, and that therefore by the Deeds of the Law no Flesh could be justified in his sight; Now, says he, *the Righteousness of God without Law, is manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets; even the Righteousness of God which is by the Faith of Jesus Christ:—For all have sinned and come short of the Glory of God; being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood*, Chap. iii. Now what is this *Redemption that is in Jesus Christ*? Or, what is meant by his being *set forth by God as the Propitiation in his Blood*? Or to what purpose is all this brought in? Our being justified by Faith without the Works of the Law, by the mere Favour of God, would be altogether as intelligible without this, and in appearance might seem to be more fully and plainly established without any mention at all of a *Redemption that is in Jesus Christ*, or of his being *set forth as a Propitiation in his Blood*. But doubtless the Apostle design'd to let us know that the *Blood*
of

of Christ had some concern in that Matter. He tells us afterwards, Chap. iv. ult. that Christ was *delivered for our Offences, and rose again for our Justification*. It follows in the next Chapter, *Being justified by Faith, we have Peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: How through Christ?* Merely by his preaching Peace? Read the following part of that Discourse, and judge whether that be all the Apostle intended.——*When we were yet without Strength, in due Time Christ died for the Ungodly. For scarcely for a righteous Man will one die, yet peradventure for a good Man one would even dare to die. But God commendeth his Love to us, in that while we were yet Sinners, Christ died for us.* “Yes, he died for us, he died for our Benefit, in that he confirmed his Doctrine, sealing it as it were with his own Blood; in that he set us an Example of Suffering; in that he obtain’d as a Reward of his Suffering, Power to bestow eternal Life upon his faithful Followers.” Very true; but the Apostle had plainly somewhat else in view, distinct from all this, when he speaks of Christ’s dying for us: *Being justified by his Blood, we shall be saved from Wrath through him. When we were Enemies we were reconciled to God by the Death of his Son—We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the Atonement.* In the following part of that Chapter, where he is drawing a Parallel between Adam who brought Sin and Death into the World, and Christ the Author of Man’s Recovery and Salvation, he concludes, *As by the Disobedience of one many were made Sinners; so by the Obedience of one* (i. e. his being obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross; for he had before said, *We are justified by his Blood*) *many are made Righteous.* Chap. viii. 3.—*God sending his Son in the Likeness of sinful Flesh, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\omega\varsigma$ $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\eta\alpha$, and a Sacrifice for Sin, condemned Sin in the Flesh.* Ver. 32. *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him for us all.* (Vide Chap. iv.

iv. ult. *Who was deliver'd for our Offences.*) Ver. 34. *Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died.* What a Force doth this Answer carry in it, or rather, if we take the last Words as continuing the Interrogative, what a Force and Emphasis, and Beauty is there, in the arguing, if we consider Christ as having died for our Sins to obtain the Forgiveness of them, "Who is he that condemneth? Will Christ condemn us, who died for this very Purpose to procure our Pardon?" The Apostle goes on, *Yea, rather, who rose again from the Dead [role for our Justification, Chap. iv. ult.] who also maketh Intercession for us.*

In the next Epistle, 1 Cor. we might observe from the Question, in Chap. i. 13. *Was Paul crucified for you?* that Christians always understood Christ's being crucified for them in such Sense as it was absurd to imagine that any other Person could be; yet this same Apostle elsewhere speaks of himself as being to be *offered upon the Sacrifice and Service of their Faith*, Phil. ii. 17. But this or any Service he could do for Christians, or any Benefit that might accrue to them by his Sufferings, was vastly different; and well known to be so, from what they receiv'd by Christ's having suffer'd for them; and it would be reckon'd a most absurd Thing to speak of any one's being crucified for them, in the same Sense as they well understood Christ to have been *crucified for them*: No; Christ *bare their Sins in his own Body on the Tree*: This no other could do. We may very well suppose this was included in his *preaching Christ crucified*; which he tells them he was so intent upon, that he *determin'd to know nothing among them, but Christ and him crucified*, Chap. ii. 2. and which he so much glories in, in opposition to the Contempt of *Jews and Gentiles*, who accounted it *Foolishness*, Chap. i. 18,
 &c.

§c. One would think there could be no Pretence for this Reproach and Scorn, upon declaring only that Christ suffer'd as a *Preacher of Righteousness*, through the Malice of wicked Men: This was no strange Thing even among the *Gentiles*; their own *Socrates* suffer'd in this manner. But to hear of a Sinner's being *justified by the Blood of Christ*; this they might be tempted to account Foolishness. I would ask also, what is intended by Christ's being *made of God to us Righteousness and Redemption*, as well as, and besides his being *made to us Wisdom and Sanctification*, and that with this View, *that no Flesh should glory before God?* Ch. i. latter end.

But I proceed to some Passages in that Epistle more direct and express, Ch. v. ver. 7. *Christ our Passover hath been sacrificed for us.* Ch. vi. ver. 19. *Ye are not your own, ye are bought with a Price.* The same Assertion we have, Ch. vii. ver. 23. Ch. xv. ver. 3. *I deliver'd to you first of all* [*εἰς πάντας*, as one of the principal Articles of the Christian Faith] *how that Christ died for our Sins according to the Scripture*, ver. 17. *If Christ be not risen, ye are yet in your Sins.* Where's the Connexion, if when Christ died he did not *die for our Sins*? If we set aside this as having been the Cause of his dying, we might have been very well assur'd of being freed from our Guilt by a free Promise of Pardon from God, tho' Christ had never come into the World, and so had neither died nor rose again. Let it be observ'd, this is a distinct Argument from the Consideration of Christ's Resurrection as an Evidence of the Truth of the Christian Doctrine. This he had touch'd upon before, ver. 14. *If Christ be not raised, our Preaching is vain, your Faith also is vain.* He urges it as a further Consequence, particularly with respect to their Hope in Christ; they expected the Pardon of Sins through his Death, for they had been taught that *Christ died for their Sins*,
ver

ver. 3. Now, says the Apostle: "If Christ rose not, *i. e.* when he died for your Sins; the Consequence is plain, you cannot be freed from your Guilt by his Death; his Death can be of no Significancy for this Purpose; in vain do you hope for Pardon from it: No, upon this Supposition, *ye are yet in your Sins.*" See *Rom. iv. ult.* which will illustrate this Argument. *Christ was deliver'd, says the Apostle there, for our Offences, and was raised again for our Justification.* If he had not been raised again after that he had been deliver'd for our Offences, there had been no Justification for us.

2 Cor. v. 15. *We thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.* How will this Conclusion hold, unless it be suppos'd, that he who died for all died in their stead? which indeed supposes them for whom he died to be obnoxious to Death: otherwise Persons may receive Benefit by the Death of another, and they not be suppos'd to have been obnoxious to Death themselves. The Apostle goes on, *And he died for all, that they who live should not any longer live unto themselves, but unto him who died for them, and rose again; they having obtained Life by his Death and Resurrection.* Ver. 18. *All Things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ; and hath committed to us the Ministry of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them.* Here it may be proper to take Notice of the Manner of Expression, which frequently occurs in the new Testament, *God's reconciling us unto himself, or Christ's reconciling us unto God* which some would understand as denoting merely a Reconciliation on our Part; or at least as having most direct and immediate Reference to this. But that is plainly a mistake.

God's

God's *reconciling us to himself* is bringing us into a state of Favour and Acceptance, and hath direct Reference to him as being at Peace, in Opposition to his *biding his Face from us, casting us away from his Presence*, and the like Expressions which we meet with in the Old Testament; and indeed denotes primarily his *turning away his Anger from us*. That this is the true meaning of the Phrase, is very evident from this Context. *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself*; this reconciling them to himself, the Apostle plainly makes to consist in God's *not imputing their Trespases unto them*. And this very Thing, God's having been reconciling the World unto himself, is made an Argument with Men to induce them to be reconciled unto God; which therefore is consider'd as distinct from the former, and indeed as that which may or may not follow upon it. *He hath committed to us the Word of Reconciliation*, i. e. God hath commanded us to make it known to the World, that through Christ he is now ready to forgive Men their Trespases, and to restore them to his Favour; he doth not forbid Sinners to approach, he hath open'd a Way of Access—*We therefore—pray you, be ye reconciled unto God*. And how God was reconciling the World unto himself, he further explains in the following Verse; which also is brought as an Argument to induce them to a Reconciliation on their Part. *We pray you be ye reconciled unto God, for he hath made him to be Sin for us who knew no Sin*, i. e. he hath made him to be a Sacrifice for our Sins; *that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him*; that we might obtain Pardon and Justification from God through him. It is manifestly in the same Sense the Apostle uses the Expression, of our being *reconciled unto God by the Death of his Son*, Rom. v. 10. which we have cited before. *If while we were Enemies, we were*

reconciled by the Death of his Son : Much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his Life. The Death of his Son is not there consider'd, as that which hath an Influence upon the reconciling our Minds unto him ; but as the Means by which God restores us to Peace and Favour with himself ; and is the same Thing with our being *justified by his Blood*, Verse preceding, i. e. as in the Text before us, we are reconciled unto God ; or he reconciles us to himself, in *not imputing our Trespases unto us*. This, I presume, will always be found to be the Sense of this Phrase in the New Testament. For a farther Confirmation of the Explication I have given, I might observe, that the Expression is borrow'd from the Old Testament, and is us'd, indeed, in a Case where it is incapable of being understood with reference to a Change of Disposition in the Subject. The High Priest, by the yearly Sacrifice on the great Day of Atonement, is said to *reconcile* the Holy Place, and the Tabernacle; and the Altar, i. e. the Holy Place being consider'd as defiled by the Sins of the People, upon which Account God might refuse to dwell there ; by those Sacrifices it was cleansed ; it's said, *He shall make Atonement for the Holy Place, because of the Uncleaness of the Children of Israel, and because of their Transgressions in all their Sins*; and concerning the Altar, *He shall cleanse it and ballow it from the Uncleaness of the Children of Israel*. Thus were these Things reconcil'd ; and one might say *God was in Aaron reconciling the Holy Place unto himself* ; i. e. he declared that upon Aaron's doing those Things which were appointed, he was willing to continue his gracious Presence there ; whereas upon account of the Uncleaness of the Children of Israel, and because of their Transgressions in all their Sins, he might justly, and would if these Things had not been done, have withdrawn from them.

them. See the Account of this Matter in the xvith Chapter of *Leviticus* ^f. In

^f It is suppos'd that it may be objected to the Explanation we have given of *God's reconciling the World to himself by Jesus Christ*; "That this seems to imply that the Death of Christ makes an Alteration in the Divine Mind towards us; and if so, that this will transfer our Obligation from the Father to the Son," I do not say, that Christ's Interposition was the Cause of an Inclination or Disposition in God to shew Mercy; but do own on the contrary, that Divine Mercy was the Spring and Original of our Redemption by Christ. I conceive the Matter thus, and it lies very clear and easy in my Mind; God was of his own free Goodness inclin'd to receive apostate Mankind into Favour; but he did not think fit that they should be brought into a State of Favour without Christ's dying for them: And this is the Constitution settled by Divine Wisdom, that Sinners shall receive Forgiveness in this Way. Thus the Apostle very justly, *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual Blessings in Christ—Having predestinated us to the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good Pleasure of his Will, to the Praise of the Glory of his Grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved: In whom we have Redemption through his Blood, even the Forgiveness of Sins, according to the Riches of his Grace.* Might it not as well have been said "That by *Aaron's reconciling the Holy Place* (as above) the Obligation was transfer'd from God to *Aaron*?"

It is further suggested, "That this seems to represent God as loving and hating his reasonable Creatures on account of some other Thing besides their own Dispositions and Behaviour, which would be unworthy of God." If indeed upon this Account *impenitent unreformed Sinners* were taken to be the Objects of God's Love, there might have been some ground for such Reflection: But the requiring, for wise Ends of Government, somewhat besides the Repentance and Reformation of the Sinner, in order to his being restored to the Privileges he had forfeited; This doth not, as

In the Epistle to the Galatians, Ch. i. 4. *Who gave himself for our Sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil World, according to the Will of God our Father.* Chap. ii. 21. *If Righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain*—There had been no need of his dying to procure Righteousness or Justification. Chap. iii. 1. *O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, before whose Eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth evidently crucified among you.* What is the Meaning of so particular a Stress being put upon Christ's having been *evidently set forth crucified among them*? This carries a great Force, when it is consider'd that Christ then *gave himself for their Sins*, as he had said before, Chap. i. 4. or as St. Peter expresses it, that then he *bare their Sins in his own Body on the Tree*. It is likely the Apostle might have a special View to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in which Christ is in a very particular manner evidently set forth crucified before our Eyes: There they had been assured that his *Body was broken for them*, and that his *Blood was shed for the Remission of their Sins*. If this was not enough to satisfy them that Faith in Christ was sufficient for their Justification, and that they had no need to betake themselves to the Law, the Apostle thinks they must be strangely infatuated. Take away this Consideration of Christ's having suffered for our Sins, there seems to be little Foundation for such an Emphasis to be put upon Christ's having been *evidently set forth crucified among them*, with relation to the Matter he is arguing about. Ver. 13.—*Christ hath delivered us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us—that the Blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ.*

far as I can perceive, in the least interfere with the Regard which the blessed God must be supposed to have to *moral Dispositions* in the reasonable Creature.

In

In the Epistle to the *Ephesians*. Chap. i. 5, 6.
 ' He hath made us accepted in the Beloved, in
 ' whom we have Redemption through his Blood,
 ' the Forgiveness of Sins, according to the Riches
 ' of his Grace. Chap. ii. 13. In Christ Jesus
 ' ye, who sometimes were afar off, are made nigh
 ' by the Blood of Christ; for he is our Peace.'
 It may be thought perhaps, that this refers only
 to the Peace between *Jews* and *Gentiles*; it doth
 undoubtedly take in that; but it supposes as the
 Foundation of that, their being brought into a State
 of Peace and Reconciliation with God; their being
 far off. was their being far from God; and their
 being made nigh, was their being taken into the
Family and Household of God. Ver. 16. ' That he
 ' might reconcile both unto God in one Body by
 ' the Cross, and came and preached Peace to you
 ' which were afar off, and to them that were nigh;
 ' for through him we both have an Access by one
 ' Spirit unto the Father—Chap. iii. 12. In him we
 ' have Boldness and Access with Confidence by
 ' the Faith of him.—Chap. iv. ult. Forgiving
 ' one another, even as God in Christ [*we render it,*
 ' for Christ's sake] hath forgiven us.—Chap. v.
 ' 2. Walk in Love, as Christ also hath loved us, and
 ' hath given himself for us, an Offering and a Sacri-
 ' fice unto God, for a sweet smelling Savour.

In the Epistle to the *Colossians*, Chap. i. 14. ' In
 ' whom we have Redemption through his Blood,
 ' even the Forgiveness of Sins. Ver. 19. For it
 ' pleased the Father, that in him all Fulness should
 ' dwell; and having made Peace by the Blood of
 ' his Cross, by him to reconcile all Things unto
 ' himself; by him, I say, whether they be Things
 ' on Earth, or Things in Heaven. And you that
 ' were sometimes alienated, and Enemies in your
 ' Minds through wicked Works, yet now hath he
 ' reconciled

‘ reconciled in the Body of his Flesh through
 ‘ Death.—*Chap. iii. 17.* Whatsoever ye do, in Word
 ‘ or Deed, do all in the Name of the Lord Jesus,
 ‘ giving Thanks unto God, and the Father by him.

1 *Tim. ii. 5, 6.* ‘ There is one God, and one
 ‘ Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ
 ‘ Jesus, who gave himself a Ransom for all.’

There are many other Passages in *St. Paul’s Epistles*, which, to them who had known and receiv’d this Doctrine, that Christ died for our Sins, and obtain’d Redemption for us by his Death, do plainly enough appear to have Reference to this, which yet I have passed by; because there is not so direct and express mention of it, as might manifest the Doctrine to such as were not otherwise apprised of it.

I should now in Order proceed to the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. But as that Epistle is in a Manner wholly taken up with this Subject, I shall reserve it to the Close, and pass over to the Writings of the other Apostles.

I don’t find that *St. James* hath any express mention of these Doctrines, indeed his Epistle seems in great Part to be level’d against the Abuse of the Doctrine of Justification by Faith, which too many were apt to run into.

But the *Apostle Peter* makes frequent Mention of it; not indeed as professedly treating of the Subject of our Redemption by the Death of Christ but occasionally speaking of it, yet in a very particular Manner; which shews it to have been universally received and well known among Christians. In the Beginning of his Address, he takes
 Notice

Notice of it as their Privilege and Blessing that they were 'elect according to the Foreknowledge of
 ' God through Sanctification of the Spirit, unto
 ' Obedience and Sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus,
 ' *Cbap. i. 2. — ver. 18.* Forasmuch as ye know,
 ' that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible
 ' Things, as Silver and Gold—but with the pre-
 ' cious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb without
 ' Blemish and without Spot, who verily was fore-
 ' ordained before the Foundation of the World,
 ' but was manifest in these last Times for you.—
 ' *Cbap. ii. 5.* Ye as living Stones are built up a
 ' spiritual House, an holy Priesthood, to offer up
 ' spiritual Sacrifices, acceptable unto God by Je-
 ' sus Christ.—*Ver. 23.* Who his own self bare
 ' our Sins in his own Body on the Tree; that we
 ' being dead to Sin should live unto Righteousness;
 ' by whose Stripes we are healed. *Cbap. iii. 18.*
 ' For Christ also hath once suffered for Sins, the
 ' just for the unjust, that he might bring us to
 ' God.'

St. *John* is no less express, 1 Epistle, Chap. i. 7:
 ' If we walk in the Light, as he is in the Light,
 ' we have Fellowship one with another [*i. e. God*
 ' and we] and the Blood of Jesus Christ his Son
 ' cleanseth us from all Sin.—*Cbap. ii. beginning.*
 ' If any Man sin, we have an Advocate with the
 ' Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: And he is the
 ' Propitiation for our Sins: And not for ours only,
 ' but for the Sins of the whole World.—
 ' *Cbap. iv. 9, 10.* In this was manifest the Love of
 ' God towards us, because that God sent his only
 ' begotten Son, that we might live through him.
 ' Herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that
 ' God loved us, and sent his Son to be the Propi-
 ' tiation for our Sins. —*Ver. 14.* We have
 ' seen and do testify, that the Father sent the Son
 ' to

‘ to be the Saviour of the World; *to be the Saviour by being a Propitiation for our Sins.*’

In the Book of the *Revelation* there are several Passages that expressly make mention of our Redemption by the Blood of Christ. Chap. i. 5. ‘ Un-
 ‘ to him that loved us, and washed us from our
 ‘ Sins in his own Blood, and made us Kings and
 ‘ Priests unto God and his Father.’ He appears in Heaven as a *Lamb that had been slain*, and all the Host above give Glory to him under this Character; and the whole Church acknowledge his having redeemed them with his Blood, Chap. v. 6. ‘ Lo; in
 ‘ the Midst of the Throne—a Lamb, as it had
 ‘ been slain—*Ver. 9.* they sung a new Song, saying,
 ‘ thou art worthy—for thou wast slain, and hast
 ‘ redeemed us unto God by thy Blood, out of
 ‘ every Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and
 ‘ Nation; and hast made us unto our God Kings
 ‘ and Priests—*It’s added,* I beheld, and I heard the
 ‘ Voice of many Angels round about the Throne,
 ‘ and the Beasts and the Elders, and the Number
 ‘ of them was ten Thousand times ten Thousand,
 ‘ and Thousands of Thousands, saying with a loud
 ‘ Voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to re-
 ‘ ceive Power, &c. Chap. vii. 14. These are they,
 ‘ who came out of great Tribulation, and have
 ‘ washed their Robes, and made them white in
 ‘ the Blood of the Lamb.

Let us now make a Pause, and reflect a while upon what has been laid before us. I could almost wish that we might meet with a Man that had never heard any Thing of these Matters before, one who knew nothing of the *Apostles*, who or what they were; and had no Concern whether the Doctrines they taught were reasonable or unreasonable; that we might only propose it to him,

him, and he might give us a free unprejudic'd Answer, what Notion he would conceive that these Writers had, and design'd to convey to us, concerning Christ's Mediation, and his Death and Sufferings, &c. But as we are not like to meet with any such Person, who might give us this Satisfaction; all that can be done is for every Person to divest himself as much as possible from a Regard to *Consequences* which he may at first apprehend to arise from the Doctrines, and barely to attend to the plain literal obvious Sense of the Passages he hath read. I would ask such a one, what he should take to be the natural Import of the Expressions the Scriptures use, both the ancient Prophecies and the Declarations of Christ and his Apostles? and particularly,

Whether he should understand those sayings of the Prophet, 'He was wounded for our Transgressions, and bruised for our Iniquities; God laid upon him the Iniquity of us all; he made his Soul an Offering for Sin: *The Declaration of Christ, that he came to give his Life a Ransom: The Assertions of the Apostle, that Christ died for Sins, the just for the unjust; that he bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree:*' Whether, I say, without a View to some apprehended Consequences or Objections from the Things themselves, which otherwise seem to be plainly meant; he would understand such Declarations as those to mean no more than, "that Christ died for our Benefit, giving us an Example of Suffering, confirming his Doctrine, furnishing us with Motives to Obedience;" in short, whether he would not immediately apprehend that these Writers did intend to convey to us the Notion of Christ's having suffer'd in our Stead, and that Death was inflicted upon him on Account of our Sins?

Again; when Christ tells us, that his ' Blood
 ' was shed for many, for the Remission of Sins:
 ' *When St. Paul says*, In him we have Redemption
 ' through his Blood, even Forgiveness of Sins;
 ' *that* by his Blood we are brought nigh; that God
 ' hath reconciled us unto himself by the Death
 ' of his Son, having made Peace by the Blood of
 ' the Cross: *When St. Peter says*, we are redeemed
 ' not with corruptible Things, as Silver and
 ' Gold, but with the precious Blood of Christ, as
 ' of a Lamb without Spot or Blemish: *When*
 ' *St. John saith*, *that* the Blood of Jesus Christ
 ' cleanseth us from all Sin; cleanseth us from the
 ' Guilt of Sin; for nothing is more evident than
 ' that it is past Sin, Sin already committed that he
 ' speaks of, as it follows, ' If we confess our Sins, he
 ' is faithful and just to forgive us our Sins, and to
 ' cleanse us from all Unrighteousness.' When
 ' the whole Church gives Glory to Christ as having
 ' *washed them from their Sins in his own Blood*:
 ' I would ask the Person before appeal'd to, whe-
 ' ther he should conceive nothing more to be meant
 ' by all this than, " That Christ's Death and Suf-
 ' ferings are a Motive to us to forsake Sin; and
 ' " the Consideration of them a Means of our
 ' " Sanctification"? In short, whether he appre-
 ' hends from the Representation these Writers have
 ' given us, that they understood Christ's dying and
 ' shedding his Blood to have nothing to do in the
 ' Matter of procuring our Pardon, or that God hath
 ' no Regard to this in receiving a penitent Sinner to
 ' Mercy?

Once more; when Christ directs us to *ask in*
his Name: When *St. Paul* tells Christians that it
 ' is ' through Christ we have Access with Confi-
 ' dence, by the Faith of him; *that he is the Me-*
 ' diator

‘ diator between God and Men, having given him-
 ‘ self a Ransom: *When St. Peter says, we offer*
 ‘ up spiritual Sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus
 ‘ Christ: *When St. John tells us, that If any Man*
 ‘ sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus
 ‘ Christ the righteous:’ I would ask the same
 Person, if he imagin’d these and the like Ex-
 pressions to intend no more than “Christ’s hav-
 “ing come from God to invite us to come back
 “to him, and to assure us of God’s Readiness
 “to accept of us;” or, that his being the Mediator
 between God and Men, means only “his being
 “invested with Power from God to bestow Bles-
 “sings upon us;” in short, “that Christ is a
 “Mediator only as on God’s Part towards us, but
 “hath nothing to do on our behalf towards God;
 “and that we need not, and ought not, to have
 “any Dependence upon him, when we make our
 “Addresses unto God.”

The Reader will observe, I am now only en-
 quiring about the plain natural Sense of the Scrip-
 tures in the several Passages that have been cited;
 how any Man, we may suppose, would understand
 them, if he had no Objection from the Matter it-
 self against what might appear to be the natural
 Sense. What Weight there may be in any such
 Objection, is hereafter to be consider’d. In the
 mean Time, it is but just that this should be at-
 tended to; and this is certainly in Reason the first
 Thing to be consider’d.

And now if we add to all that hath been cited,
 the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, where the Author is
 directly and at large treating of these Subjects;
 there seems to be no Room for Hesitation as to
 this first Point. The Reader I hope will bear
 with me in making large Citations from this Epistle:

the

the Assertions are exprefs; the Representations that are given of Christ's acting as a Priest, and of the Virtue of his Blood as offer'd by Way of Sacrifice, are plain, very strong and lively.

At the Beginning of the Epistle, in the first Account he gives of that glorious Person, by whom this last Dispensation of Grace was brought to Men, he takes Notice of this Performance, that *he had purged our Sins by himself*. Let it be observ'd here, the Terms, *purging or purifying, sanctifying, cleansing,* and the like, throughout this Epistle, are, if I may so call them, *sacrisfical Terms*, and always relate to the Guilt or Pollution contracted by Sins committed: And so these Terms are frequently used in the Old Testament, see particularly *David's penitential Psalm*, li.—‘Blot out my Transgressions; wash me thoroughly from mine Iniquity, and cleanse me from my Sin: For I acknowledge my Transgressions, and my Sin is ever before me. Against thee, thee only have I sinned,—Purge me with Hyssop and I shall be clean: Wash me, and I shall be whiter than Snow.’ Who doth not see that the washing and cleansing here spoken of is of a very different Consideration from what he prays for afterwards. *Ver. 10.* ‘Create in me a clean Heart, O God, and renew a right Spirit within me?’

Chap. ii. 9. ‘We see Jesus for a little while made lower than the Angels—that he by the Grace of God might taste Death for every Man.—*Ver. 14.* Forasmuch then as the Children are Partakers of Flesh and Blood, he also himself in like Manner took Part of the same, that through Death, he might destroy him who had the Power of Death, that is the Devil; and deliver them who through Fear of Death were all their Life-time
‘subje

' subject to Bondage—*Ver. 17.* It behoved him in
 ' all Things to be made like unto his Brethren,
 ' that he might be a merciful and faithful High-
 ' priest in Things pertaining to God, to make Re-
 ' conciliation for the Sins of the People, *αρχιερεως*
 ' *τα προς τον θεον εις το ιλασθαι τας αμαρτιας.* —
 ' *Chap. iv. 14.* Seeing then we have so great an
 ' High-priest, Jesus the Son of God, who is pas-
 ' sed into the Heavens, let us hold fast our Pro-
 ' fession; for we have not an High-priest that
 ' cannot be touched with the Feeling of our Infir-
 ' mities—Let us therefore come boldly to the
 ' Throne of Grace. *Chap. v. beginning.* For
 ' every High-priest taken from among Men is or-
 ' dained for Men in Things pertaining to God,
 ' [*οτι οτι ανθρωπων καθισταται τα προς τον θεον*] that he may
 ' offer both Gifts and Sacrifices ——— And no
 ' Man taketh this Honour unto himself, but he
 ' that is called of God; as was *Aaron*: So Christ
 ' glorified not himself to be made an High priest,
 ' but he who said unto him—Thou art a Priest
 ' for ever after the Order of *Melchisedec*. *Ver. 9.*
 ' And being made perfect; after that he had fi-
 ' nish'd his Sufferings, or, being consecrated by his
 ' Sufferings; he became the Author of eternal Sal-
 ' vation to all them that obey him: The Author
 ' of eternal Salvation as an *High-priest* acting for
 ' them in Things pertaining to God; so the follow-
 ' ing Words as well as the whole preceding Dis-
 ' course, oblige us to understand it. Being made
 ' perfect, he became the Author, of eternal Salva-
 ' tion——being called of God an High-Priest
 ' after the Order of *Melchisedec*.

Chap. vii. 11, &c. ' If therefore Perfection
 ' were by the Levitical Priesthood; what farther
 ' need was there, that another Priest should arise
 ' after the Order of *Melchisedec*?——Inasmuch

‘ as not without an Oath he was made Priest—
 ‘ And they truly were many Priests, because they
 ‘ were not suffered to continue by Reason of
 ‘ Death: but this Man because he continueth ever
 ‘ hath an unchangeable Priesthood; wherefore he
 ‘ is able to save unto the uttermost all that come
 ‘ unto God by him; *i. e. plainly, who come unto*
 ‘ *God by him as their High-priest*: seeing that he
 ‘ ever liveth to make Intercession for them. For
 ‘ such an High-priest became us, who is holy—
 ‘ who needeth not daily, as those High-priests, to
 ‘ offer up Sacrifice, first for his own Sins, and
 ‘ then for the Peoples; for this he did once [*i. e.*
 ‘ *the latter*] when he offered up himself. For the
 ‘ Law made High-priests who have Infirmary, but
 ‘ the Word of the Oath which was since the Law,
 ‘ maketh the Son; *i. e. maketh the Son High-priest,*
 ‘ *who is consecrated for evermore.*” Need I now
 to ask any Man who reads this Chapter, whether
 the Writer doth not here represent Christ to be as
 truly, as strictly, as properly an *High-priest* as any
 were under the Law? Let us go on to the next,
Cb. viii. ‘ Now of the Things which we have
 ‘ spoken, this is the Sum: We have such an High-
 ‘ priest who is set on the right Hand of the Throne
 ‘ of the Majesty in the Heavens; a Minister of
 ‘ the Sanctuary and of the true Tabernacle. For
 ‘ every High-priest is ordained to offer Gifts and
 ‘ Sacrifices: Wherefore it is of Necessity that
 ‘ this Man [*or this High-priest*] have somewhat to
 ‘ offer. For if he were on Earth, he should not
 ‘ be a Priest; seeing that there are Priests accord-
 ‘ ing to the Law.” This supposes that he was as
 much a Priest in Heaven, as they were at that Time
 on Earth: as it follows, ‘ but now hath he obtain-
 ‘ ed a more excellent Ministry. *And this be more*
 ‘ *fully shews, Cbap ix.* ‘ Into the second Taber-
 ‘ nacle went the High Priest alone, not without
 ‘ Blood:

' Blood, which he offer'd for himself and for the
 ' Errors of the People—in which were offered
 ' both Gifts and Sacrifices that could not make
 ' him that did the Service perfect, as pertaining
 ' to the Conscience. But Christ being come, an
 ' High Priest of good Things to come, by a
 ' greater and more perfect Tabernacle, not made
 ' with Hands; neither by the Blood of Goats and
 ' Calves, but by his own Blood he enter'd in once
 ' into the holy Place, having obtained eternal Re-
 ' demption for us. For if the Blood of Bulls and
 ' of Goats, and the Ashes of an Heifer sprinkling
 ' the Unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the
 ' Flesh; how much more shall the Blood of
 ' Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered
 ' himself without Spot unto God, purge your Con-
 ' sciences from dead Works, to serve the living
 ' God?—*Ver.* 22. For almost all Things
 ' are by the Law purged with Blood; and without
 ' shedding of Blood there is no remission. It was
 ' therefore necessary that the Patterns of Things in
 ' the Heavens should be purified with these; but
 ' the heavenly Things themselves with better Sa-
 ' crifices than these. For Christ is not enter'd
 ' into the holy Places made with Hands, which
 ' are the Figures of the true; but into Heaven
 ' itself, now to appear in the Presence of God for
 ' us. Nor yet that he should offer himself often
 ' ——— for then must he often have suffered since
 ' the Foundation of the World. But now once
 ' in the End of the World hath he appeared to put
 ' away Sins by the Sacrifice of himself——Christ
 ' was once offered to bear the Sins of many; and
 ' to them who look for him shall he appear the
 ' second Time without Sin unto Salvation——
 ' *Chap.* x. 4, &c. It is not possible that the
 ' Blood of Bulls and of Goats should take away
 ' Sins; wherefore when he cometh into the World
 ' he

' he saith, Sacrifices and Offerings thou wouldest
 ' not, but a Body hast thou prepared me—He
 ' taketh away the first that he may establish the
 ' second——By the which Will of God we are
 ' sanctified, through the Offering of the Body of
 ' Christ once for all. And every High Priest stand-
 ' eth daily ministring, and offering oftentimes the
 ' same Sacrifices, which can never take away Sins ;
 ' but this Man, after he had offered one Sacrifice
 ' for Sin, for ever sat down on the right Hand of
 ' God——For by one Offering he hath perfected
 ' for ever them that are sanctified——Having
 ' therefore Boldness to enter into the Holiest by the
 ' Blood of Jesus——And having an High Priest
 ' over the House of God, let us draw near with a
 ' true Heart, in full Assurance of Faith ; having
 ' our Hearts sprinkled from an evil Conscience—
 ' If we sin wilfully——there remaineth no more
 ' Sacrifice for Sin——Of how much sorer Pu-
 ' nishment shall he be thought worthy, who hath
 ' trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted
 ' the Blood of the Covenant wherewith he was
 ' sanctified an unholy Thing. Chap. xii. 24. Ye
 ' are come to Jesus, the Mediator of the New
 ' Covenant, and to the Blood of sprinkling, which
 ' speaketh better Things than Abel's. Chap. xiii.
 ' 11. The

¶ This is the true Rendring. *Abel* offered *ελεονα θυσιαν παρα Καν*, a more excellent Sacrifice than *Cain* offered. (See also Chap. iii. 3.) so here to the Blood of sprinkling, *καλινονα λαλειν παρα τοι Αβελ*, that speaketh better Things than *Abel* speaketh ; referring no doubt to what he had before remark'd in so particular a Manner concerning *Abel*, Chap. xi. 4. *He being dead yet speaketh* i. e. having died by the Hand of *Cain*, after that he had obtained Witness that he was righteous : God testifying of his Gifts, being dead he yet speaketh, that there is a Reward for the Righteous ; but this
 Blood

‘ 11. The Bodies of those Beasts whose Blood is
 ‘ brought into the Sanctuary by the High Priest for
 ‘ Sin, are burnt without the Camp: Wherefore
 ‘ Jesus also, that he might sanctify the People with
 ‘ his own Blood, suffered without the Gate——
 ‘ By him therefore let us offer the Sacrifice of
 ‘ Praise to God continually.’

After this, and much more to the same Purpose in that Epistle, I must say, if this Writer doth not make Christ to be a *proper Priest*, and his Death to be a *proper Sacrifice*; I despair of ever knowing the Sentiments of a Writer upon any Subject. These are not occasional Allusions, figurative Expressions, or rhetorical Accommodations; 'tis the direct Subject of the Epistle to shew, that we have an High Priest of our Profession in every respect superior to their High Priest under the Law, and a better Sacrifice than theirs; the Point is solemnly argued; he professedly considers, what the Office of a Priest is; and shews how Christ answers the Description: He proves from the Old Testament, that God, in the most solemn Manner that could be, appointed him to this Office, and called him to this Honour (as he did *Aaron*;) he shews how Christ was qualified for it, and how he fulfils his Ministry; he shews the superior Excellency, and the greater Efficacy of the Sacrifice Christ offered; so far from giving any colour of Pretence for the Supposition of Figure and mere Allusion in this Way of representing the Design of Christ's Death,

Blood of Sprinkling speaketh better Things than *Abel* being dead speaketh; for this gives us the Assurance of an eternal Salvation. If the Author had meant, better Things than the Blood of *Abel* speaketh (which seems flat and poor) it should have been *παρα το νεκρον*.

and

and the Effect of it, he plainly tells them, that their Sacrifices and their Priesthood under the Law, were only Figures, Types, and Shadows of Christ's Sacrifice and his Priesthood; and that this Sacrifice was required because of the Weakness and Insufficiency of the former to answer the grand Design of a Sacrifice, *They could not take away Sin*; this hath done it (*Chap. x. beginning.*) And because Perfection was not by the Levitical Priesthood, there was ' need that another Priest should ' arise after the Order of *Melchisedec*, and not after the Order of *Aaron* (*Chap. vii. 11.*) for such ' an High Priest became us——who needed not ' daily to offer up Sacrifice, first for his own Sins, ' and then for the Peoples, *as they did (ver. 26)*'

Such a Person as we wish'd for to be an Arbitrator to appeal to about the plain Meaning of the Passages of Scripture, would certainly be at a Loss to imagine what would be said by those who own the sacred Authority of this Epistle, and yet deny Christ to be a proper Priest, and his Death to be a proper Sacrifice.

A late ingenious Writer, to whom all that wish well to Christianity will think themselves obliged, for his solid and judicious Defence of the *Usefulness and Truth of the Christian Revelation*, seems to think that *we are not under a Necessity of understanding these Things strictly*, " but only that there is " something analogous in the Christian Religion " to what these *Hebrews* so highly valued in " the *Mosaical Institution*.^b" If after what hath

^b *Foster*, p. 346. in second Edition, p. 348. he is speaking there particularly of " Christ's interceding for " us in consequence of the Sacrifice he had offer'd." " The

hath been said, any one can think this comes up to the Solemnity of the Argument in that Epistle, I must leave him to his own Judgment.

Others I have met with, who would account for these Things after another manner; not so much by mollifying the Expressions, and indeed they are too plain and positive, and the Matters too strongly insisted on to be taken for mere Allusions or Analogies; they are willing therefore to allow, if I take them right, that we understand the whole Discourse of this Writer in the plain *literal* Sense; but then they suppose all that he says with relation to these Matters to be by way of *Condescension*, to accommodate himself to the *Hebrews*, who set so high a Value upon the *Mosaical* Institution.

“ These *Hebrews* had been us’d from their Infancy,
 “ and their first Acquaintance with any thing of
 “ Religion, to expect Divine Favour by means of
 “ Sacrifices, and by the Ministry of an High
 “ Priest, for whom they had the highest Venera-
 “ tion; in short, had been bred up to such an
 “ Opinion of these Things, that they could not
 “ tell how to conceive of our obtaining Blessings
 “ from Heaven but in such a Way; upon this

“ The Apostle he supposes, might only design by it
 “ (which, *says Mr. F.* appears plainly to have been
 “ his View in the greatest Part of the Epistle to the
 “ *Hebrews*) that there was something analogous in
 “ the Christian Religion to what they so highly valued
 “ in the *Mosaic* Institution.” But I must advertise the
 Reader, that Mr. F. says in his Postscript, p. 28, that
 “ he allow’d every Thing that the Scripture has *plainly*
 “ and *distinctly* asserted upon this Head [*i. e.* the Doc-
 “ trine relating to Christ’s Sacrifice] without the least
 “ thought of evading the *grammatical* and *obvious*
 “ Sense of any of the Texts, by strain’d and unnatu-
 “ ral Criticisms.”

“ Account

“ Account the Author of this Epistle thought fit
 “ in compliance with their Prejudices, to repre-
 “ sent Christ as answering to their High Priest,
 “ and his Death as answering to their Sacrifices ;
 “ we being as fully secured of the Divine Favour
 “ and Blessing by receiving the Christian Institu-
 “ tion *as if* Christ had offer’d himself a Sacrifice,
 “ and made Intercession ; in short, *as if* he had in
 “ reality transacted for us as our High Priest.”

But is this the Simplicity and Sincerity of an *Apostle*
 of Christ, to secure his Profelytes by a feigned
 Representation of Things, perswading them that
 they need not leave Christianity for want of a Priest
 and a Sacrifice, telling them they had a much bet-
 ter Sacrifice, and a more excellent High Priest un-
 der the Gospel Dispensation, when in reality there
 was no such Thing¹ ? Would not any one think it
 much

¹ It hath been suggested, “ That this stooping to
 “ our Conceptions in this particular Instance, and
 “ Compliance with the *Jewish* Prejudices, may be
 “ thought as perfectly consistent with Sincerity, as the
 “ many other Condescensions to human Weakness,
 “ which we meet with in every part of this Revela-
 “ tion ; and it may be suppos’d, that Christians would
 “ no more have taken these Expressions literally, than
 “ they do so mistake those other Expressions or *God’s*
 “ *Hands and Eyes*, &c. if their Guides and Teachers
 “ had not universally misled them : ‘ They soon found
 “ such Representations as these proper to graft both
 “ their Power and their Profit upon ; (two darling fa-
 “ vourite Points) while in Popery the Priest hath the
 “ sole absolute Power of repeating this efficacious Sa-
 “ crifice at what Times, and for whose Benefit he
 “ pleases, and among Protestants we know there are
 “ Men who contend that they have an exclusive Right
 “ and Commission effectually to commemorate, or ce-
 “ lebrate the Remembrance of this Sacrifice.” I think
 “ I have shewed a manifest difference between the
 solemn

much more becoming a Preacher of Truth, to have told them plainly, that since they had express Assurances from the Son of God himself, that God is ready to pardon and accept us upon our Repentance and sincere Obedience, they had no need to pay any more Regard to those Things they were so fond of; which for some Reasons might be fit to be observed for a Time, but were in themselves of no Value? Instead of this, to represent it in

solemn treating upon this Subject in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and such occasional condescending Expressions as we sometimes meet with in the sacred Writers. As to the Insinuation of that which might give occasion to the Guides and Teachers to maintain this literal Sense, it appears to me altogether groundless. I am persuaded the Doctrine of our Redemption by the Death of Christ, and of Christ's being a Priest, was generally received among Christians long before there was any Design in the Clergy to make a handle of it for advancing their Power or Profit. The perverting a Doctrine, and abusing it to some worldly Advantage, is no argument against it.

It is further said, "That since there must be something figurative in all these Expressions, *Redemption, Purchasing, Propitiation, Atonement, and Sacrifice*, when any of them are used to express what Christ hath done for us, it must therefore be allow'd that in some respects Christ's Death does resemble a Sacrifice, or the Term would never have been applied to it; but yet that it may be frequently applied, without designing to intimate, that the Likeness would hold throughout, *e. g.* Was there ever any expiatory Sacrifice heard or read of in the World, in which either the Sinner himself, or the Priest who offer'd it, did not at the Time of the Offering declare this design, or desire that such Sacrifice might be accepted as a Propitiation?" *Sacrifice* hath a proper Sense without a Figure, as much as any other Word

in so solemn a Manner as the Doctrine of the Christian Religion, that Christ offered himself a Sacrifice, and that he is constituted of God the High Priest of our Profession; this, methinks, is altogether out of Character; no ways suiting those who made their Boast, that they *handed not the Word of God deceitfully, but used great plainness of Speech, and by Manifestation of Truth commended themselves to every Man's Conscience in the Sight of God* (2 Cor. iv. 2.) And truly if this were the Case, it might

Word or Term; and is taken in the literal Sense when applied to the Death of Christ. The shedding his Blood, and the offering himself to God, did as truly and properly make Atonement, as the Blood of any Sacrifice under the Levitical Law. Nor do I see any Necessity of making the Terms *Redemption*, or *Purchasing* figurative, when applied to what Christ hath done: These are indeed Terms frequently us'd upon other Occasions, and about other Matters; but the Notion, or Thing signified, doth as truly and properly belong to what Christ hath done: as to other Matters about which these Terms may be used, *i. e.* Christ did as truly ransom us, by giving his Life for us as a Man redeems a Slave when he pays a Sum of Money for his Ransom. The Sinner's, or the Priest's *declaring the Design at the Time of the Offering*, is not that which makes the Sacrifice, but only a Circumstance attending the offering it. If God did appoint that Christ should die for our Sins, and he did offer himself to God to make Atonement for our Guilt, his Death was a real Sacrifice, and was so accepted. And what if we should say that Christ did declare as much at or near the Time of his offering himself? I apprehend this may very well be included in that Expression of his in the solemn Prayer just before his Death, *For their sakes, ἀντὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*. Not to observe that he had in effect declared the same Thing some Time before, when he said that he came to *give his Life a Ransom for many*.

very justly be said of St. *Paul*, with respect to these *Hebrews*, if he were the Author of this Epistle, as is generally suppos'd that *being crafty he caught them with Guile*; however he might disclaim this sort of Management with respect to the *Corinthians*, (vide 2 *Cor.* xii. 16.) They who give this Account of the Matter must suppose, that the Author of this Epistle design'd, that the *Hebrews* should receive these Notions concerning Christ, as being a real Priest, &c. and consequently that they should believe that he himself had the same Notions: Now if the Author knew that these Things were not really so as he had represented to them; in short, that these Notions were false; what, I pray, can any Man make of this but downright Deceiving? And if a sacred Writer might deceive after this manner upon one Subject, why not upon another; and, what becomes then of our Faith in the Christian Revelation? It may all be Deceiving us, though perhaps, for our good. We are told that Christ is exalted to the right Hand of God, and hath Power to give eternal Life to all them that obey him, &c. This may be only a Representation to make us as secure of receiving eternal Life, as a Reward of our Obedience to his Religion, *as if* Christ himself were to confer it upon us; just as the representing him under the Character of a Priest was to give these *Hebrews* as much Assurance of their being pardon'd and accepted of God upon believing and obeying the Gospel, *as if* Christ had been really a Priest, and made Intercession for them. I may venture to say, the *kingly Office* of Christ, and his being appointed to be our *Judge*, or indeed any Thing relating to him as our Saviour, is not more plainly expressed, and more directly asserted in the New Testament, than his being a *Priest*, is in this Epistle.

To sum up the Matter, if the Author of this Epistle design'd to perswade these *Hebrews* that Christ did really offer himself a Sacrifice for Sin, and that he was appointed of God to be their High Priest (which I think is manifest beyond all Contradiction); and yet in reality there was no such Thing, and the Author knew there was no such Thing, the plain *Englisb* of this is "he taught false Doctrine." We must conclude, either that he himself had the same Sentiments, or else that he knowingly deceiv'd them, in order to keep them to the Profession of Christianity. If any Christian thinks he can defend this, let him defend it. I must own I should dread the Consequence. I believe the Enemies of Christianity would desire no more than to see the Charge made good, and would willingly leave it to Christians to make the best Defence they could of such a Management. If I may give my Judgment, I should think the Opposers of these Doctrines would do much better entirely to reject the Authority of this Epistle, which bears so hard upon them: Though indeed neither would that avail much; for the same Charge would lie against other of the sacred Writings, though perhaps not in so flagrant a Manner.

There are some other Things mention'd by the ingenious Writer we before took Notice of, which may seem to weaken, in some degree, the Force of what hath been urged for establishing the literal Sense of Scripture concerning these Matters. It hath been suggested, that the "Death of Christ" was no more than was to be expected in the natural Course of Things; and was indeed the natural Consequence of his attempting to reform the Manners of a degenerate Age, and opposing
" the

“ the Superstition and darling Prejudices of the
 “ *Jewish* Nation; and could not be avoided but
 “ by such a Compliance on his part as would not
 “ have been consistent with Virtue, or by a mira-
 “ culous Interposition of Providence: Consequent-
 “ ly all that can be immediately attributed to God
 “ in the whole Affair, is, that he sent him into
 “ the World, tho’ he foresaw the Consequence of
 “ it; and order’d that his Death which would
 “ have happen’d without a Miracle, if there had
 “ been no such Design, should be regarded as a
 “ Sacrifice.” (*Foster*, p. 331, second Edition,
 p. 333). But let us hear what Account the Scrip-
 ture gives of this Matter.

Doth not the Scripture represent the Sufferings
 of Christ as laid upon him by God himself? *It*
pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to
Grief, when thou shalt make his Soul an offering for
Sin. (Isaiah liii.) Accordingly in the New Testa-
 ment it’s frequently spoken of as God’s Act, that
 he delivered him up, and this accordingly to a de-
 terminate Counsel; *He being deliver’d by the deter-*
minate Counsel and Foreknowledge of God, ye have taken
 (Acts ii. 23.) and (Chap. iv. 28) *Against thy holy*
Child Jesus,—were the People of Israel gathered
together, for to do whatsoever thy Hand and thy Coun-
sel determined before to be done. God spared not his
own Son, but delivered him up for us all. (Rom. vii. 32).
 Doth not our Lord himself speak of his suffering
 Death as being, in part at least, the Design of his
 coming into the World? *The Son of Man came to*
give his Life a Ransom for many. (Mat. xx. 28.) How
 often doth he speak of his giving himself, or
 laying down his Life for the Sheep? But see par-
 ticularly *John* x. 17, 18. *Therefore doth my Father*
love me, because I lay down my Life that I might take
it again: No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down
of myself: I have Power to lay it down, and I have
 D Power

Power to take it again. This Commandment have I received of my Father. The Words, methinks, could not well be more express to the Purpose, if they had been directly design'd to obviate any such Imagination that might arise from the Manner of his Dying, as if it were only according to the natural Course of Things from the Malice of his Enemies. I lay down my Life: No Man taketh it from me; but I lay it down of myself—This Commandment have I received of my Father.

Upon this Consideration, because it was appointed for him to die for our Sins, and he came with this Design, he declines (however innocent Nature might relucate) so much as to pray to be saved from it: *What shall I say, Father, save me from this Hour? but for this Cause came I to this Hour.* (John xii. 27.) Nor do I think the earnest Prayer three times repeated in his Agony in the Garden, is to be understood of his praying to be excused from the Death of the Cross. How could he say, *Father, to thee all Things are possible, or, if it be possible let this Cup pass from me*; when he knew that in the Sense there meant it was not possible; for as he himself declares, *for this End he came to that Hour*; and upon that Account rejected the Motion which Nature suggested, and which perhaps any other besides him would have been tempted to comply with, *i. e.* to pray to be saved from it, as in the Passage before refer'd to: “ Now is my Soul troubled, and what shall I say? “ shall I say, Father save me from this Hour? “ this might be natural upon this Occasion; but “ I do not, I cannot say this; No: for this Cause “ came I to this Hour; and instead of saying, “ Father save me from that Hour, my Prayer is, “ Father glorify thy Name: Glorify thy Name “ in bringing upon me or in suffering that to “ come upon me, which thou hast appointed and “ which

“ which I came to suffer.” This appears to me to be the genuine Sense of that Passage. * And now to suppose that afterwards, when he was come to that Hour ; he prayed with so much Earnestness to be saved from it, seems to be plainly to carry in it an Inconsistency or Inconstancy of Mind, which I dare not attribute to our blessed Lord. That Cup therefore which he then prayed to have removed, means only, as I suppose, that present Distress, whatever it was, and whatever might be the Occasion of it, which perhaps we cannot clearly understand or account for. ¹ And in

* I could never like the Expression commonly us'd upon this Occasion, that *our Saviour immediately corrects himself*: If he corrected himself, he had gone too far, *i. e.* his Concern had carried him beyond the due Bounds ; which I dare not impute to our blessed Lord in any one Instance ; no not for a Moment.

¹ That seems to me to have been an unexpected Trouble and Distress, which the Wisdom of God saw fit our Saviour should be tried with, in all Respects he might be tempted like as we are tempted. His suffering Death was a Thing known to him from the Beginning. he came into the World for that Purpose, he always speaks of it as a Thing absolutely determin'd, he had a clear View of it in all its Circumstances ; so that he had, as we may say, his whole Life-time to prepare and fore-arm himself for that Trial. But here is, as should seem, a surprise of Trouble and Distress coming upon him, a Distress of an extraordinary Nature indeed ; all the Evangelists that mention it represent it as being in the highest Degree ; it was perhaps as great as could possibly come upon an innocent Mind. *He began to be sore amazed, and to be very heavy.* He says to the three Disciples whom he took to watch with him, *my Soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto the Death.* He was in an Agony, and his Sweat was as it were great drops of Blood falling to the Ground. But in this Height of unexpected Trouble and Distress, he expresses the same entire Submission ; *not as I will, but as thou wilt.*

in Answer to his Prayer I do suppose that Cup was taken from him; the Author to the *Hebrews* says

'Tis particularly with Respect to this Trial that the Writer to the *Hebrews* makes that remarkable Observation, *tho' he were a Son, yet learned he Obedience by the Things which he suffer'd.* What hath been said here of this Matter is propos'd only as a Conjecture. But as to the Point above insisted on, *viz.* that the Cup which he so earnestly prayed to have remov'd, was not, could not be, his *dying upon the Cross*, is with me past all Doubt. What must we say; that our Lord strangely forgot himself, when he prayed so earnestly three Times successively to have that prevented which he had all along spoken of to his Disciples, as a Thing absolutely determin'd? yea, and that but a few Minutes before; having told them the Circumstances of *Juda's* betraying him, declaring at the same Time his own Resolution, and the Event with Respect to himself, as well as with Respect to *Judas*, *Truly the Son of Man goeth as it was determined: But wo unto that Man by whom he is betrayed,* Luke xxii. 22. foretelling *Peter's* denying him, and their being all scattered from him, because it was written, *I will smite the Shepherd, &c.* but, says he *after that I am risen I will go before you into Galilee;* telling them that that *which was written must be accomplish'd in him.* He was numbred among the Transgressors, for, says he, *the Things concerning me have an End.* All this was but a very little Time before his Agony. To which we may add that solemn Prayer before his Passion, recorded by *St. John*, Chap. xvii. where he prays for the Reward, as *having finish'd the Work the Father had given him to do.* That after all this; yea and just after that he had instituted a solemn Memorial of his Death to be kept up in his Church throughout all Generations; and in the Celebration of that Ordinance had represented his Body as actually broken and his Blood as shed, saying, *this is my Body which is broken for you, &c.* that after this he should go immediately, and pray in such a Manner to be excus'd from dying! who can believe it? I must confess this would appear to me below the ordinary Resolution, or even common Prudence, that is to be found among Men.

says, that he *was heard*; when he had offered up Prayers and Supplications with strong Crying and Tears; was heard, so as to be deliver'd from his Fear. (Vide *Whitby* in loc. *Heb. v. 7*) Nay, doth not our Lord himself intimate that if he would have prayed to be saved from dying, he should have been heard even in that Request? *Thinkest thou*, says he to *Peter*, at the Time when his Enemies came to apprehend him, *that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve Legions of Angels?* (*Matt. xxvi. 54*). But he knew that it was appointed for him: *The Cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?* (*John xviii. 11.*) and in the Place before refer'd to, *How then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?* So that he saw in this Case, if I may so speak, a Necessity laid upon him, and therefore would never be perswaded to pray to be deliver'd. He knew that *thus it must be*: For this End he came to that Hour.

The *Writer to the Hebrews* represents it as the main Design of the Son of God's taking Flesh, that he might taste of Death: *We see Jesus for a little while made lower than the Angels—that he by the Grace of God should taste Death for every Man.* (*Chap. ii. 9.*) Forasmuch then as the Children are partakers of Flesh and Blood, he also himself likewise took Part of the same, that through Death he might destroy him who had the Power of Death, (*Ver. 14.*) *When he cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifices and Offerings thou wouldest not—but a Body hast thou prepared me.* For what Purpose did God prepare him this Body? that when those former Sacrifices were rejected as insufficient for the Purpose of taking away Sins, we might be sanctified through the Offering of the Body of Christ once for all. (*Chap. x.—10.*) St. Peter

speaks of Christ as *fore-ordained before the Foundation of the World*; fore-ordained to be a Lamb, without Spot or Blemish, by whose precious Blood we should be redeem'd. (1 *Pet.* i. 19. 20.) I do not alledge for this Purpose the Words in *Revel.* xiii. 8. the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World; because indeed I take those Words, *from the Foundation of the World*, to refer to the Writing the Names in the Book of Life—whole Names were not written *from the Foundation of the World*, in the slain Lamb's Book of Life. But if my Interpretation be not admitted, this Passage will be a farther Confirmation of the Point before us. Upon the whole, I think the Scripture hath taken Care sufficiently to obviate any Objection against the Representation it gives of Christ's Death *being design'd as a Sacrifice*, from the Manner of its coming upon him.

No Doubt the Way in which our Saviour suffer'd was for many Reasons the most fit and proper. There might be other excellent Purposes serv'd by his suffering in this Way, besides that of his being a Sacrifice^m. We have no need therefore to assert that his *Death was appointed solely with a View to that* (Mr. Foster, p. 329. second Edit. p. 331.) 'The greater is the Display of the divine Wisdom, if it was so order'd as might answer other good and useful Purposes, besides that which we suppose to be the main Thing in View, the offering himself a Sacrifice for the Sins of the World. And to speak freely, it hath in my Mind the Appearance of a low mean Contrivance, unworthy the blessed God and the Redeemer, to take Advantage as it were of an Event that was in some sort accidental, or which came to pass only according to the common
and

^m What the Author means there by adding *Arbitrarily* [*was not appointed arbitrarily and solely with a View to that*] I do not well understand.

and ordinary Course of Things, and make an Use of it that it was not originally design'd for. Me-thinks it sounds odd, that God should direct us to consider and improve the Death of Christ under the Notion of a Sacrifice ; when, in Reality, or in itself, it was no Sacrifice ; nor was design'd to be so. ⁿ.

But

ⁿThis appeared to me to be the Representation which Mr. F. had given of this Matter, when he said in the foremention'd Passage, " That all that could be immediately attributed to God in the whole Affair, was " that he sent Christ into the World, tho' he foresaw " the Consequences of it ; and order'd that his Death " which would have happen'd *if there had been no such* " *Design* [i. e. of his dying for the guilty] should be re- " garded as a Sacrifice ;" And before, " That God, " who foresaw all Things, appointed that the Death " of Christ, which *really happen'd in the natural* " *Course of Things*, should be consider'd as a Sacri- " fice : " And afterwards, (p. 336. second Edition, p. 338.) " That the Death of Christ, which hap- " pen'd in the natural Course of Things was not ap- " pointed *directly*", [he adds indeed, " and only] " with that View." Mr. F. in his *postscript* acknow- ledges, " that the Death of Christ was undoubtedly " pre-determined ; and that it was the View of God " in sending Christ into the World, that the Death of " this divine Messenger, which he foresaw would " happen if not miraculously prevented, might an- " swer the wise and valuable Ends of a Sacrifice for " Sin ; as well as that he might reform the World as " a Prophet ; without determining which of these was " the principal Reason, p. 363." I should not con- tend with any one for more ; (tho' I have indeed de- clar'd ; that to me the Scripture seems to represent the former as the principal ; at least the principal Reason of his being appointed to die ; and am still of that Mind). And this being granted, it doth not appear to me to be of so great Importance in the present Argument

But, allowing that in the natural Course of Things Christ's Management would expose him to die by the Hands of the *Jews*; (to say nothing of the particular Kind of Death which he suffer'd; which I think no man can affirm to be what was naturally to be expected; rather, humanly speaking, there were great odds against his being put to Death on the Cross) could not God have interpos'd? could not Christ have rescued himself, as he did more than once when *his hour was not yet come*? and might he not have fully answer'd the Purposes of his prophetic Office tho' he had done so? To conclude, since the Scripture assures us that Christ voluntarily gave up himself into the Hands of his Enemies, and therefore he himself calls it *laying down his Life*; and truly he gave abundant Evidence of this: Knowing before hand that they would come that very Night to apprehend him, he goes to the Place for this very Purpose, to put himself, as I may say, into their Hands. Vide *John* xiv. 30, 31. *The Prince of this World cometh, and hath nothing in me. But that the World may know that I love the Father, and as the Father gave me Commandment; even so I do. Arise let us*

as Mr. F. imagines, (Vide p. 361). to consider, whether "the Death of Christ would have happen'd, if "it had never been design'd as a Sacrifice;" however, I cannot fall in with his Assertion, "that we *must* suppose that it would have actually happen'd if it had "never been appointed as a Sacrifice." Nor do I think we need trouble our selves with such Suppositions as are mention'd, p. 365. which he calls *imaginary Schemes*. The all-perfect Mind had the whole Scene in View before him; and if he hath declared, that this was one End for which he determin'd to deliver up his *Son* into the Hands of wicked Men, that by his Death he might make Atonement for Sin; it is enough.

go hence : When they come, he goes forth to meet them, asks them, who it was they sought, tells them that he is the Person; and when *Peter* in his Zeal would have defended him, he stops his Attempt, saying, *The Cup which my Father hath given me shall I not drink it?* (Vide Chap. xviii. of St. *John's* Gospel :) since Christ declares that *this Commandment he had received of the Father*; and that he came with this View and Design, *to give his Life a Ransom*; certainly the Manner of his being put to Death, that is to say, it's being done *by the wicked Hands* of Men, doth no Ways hinder his Death from being in Reality and in the Design of God; and in *his* Design, according to the Representation of Scripture, an offering and a Sacrifice for the Sins of the World.

In like Manner his appearing and acting as a Prophet during his Abode on Earth, doth not at all interfere with his coming to be a *Priest*, i. e. to give himself a Sacrifice in his Death, and to officiate afterwards as our High-priest in the heavenly Sanctuary. There were doubtless many great and excellent Ends answer'd by the Son of God's coming in the Flesh. He first appeared as a Prophet revealing the Will of God, and familiarly conversing with Men; his Incarnation fitted him for this. And he had a Body prepared for him, that *through the offering his Body once for all he might for ever perfect them that are sanctified*; and that being in all Things made like unto us, *he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in Things pertaining to God, to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People*. Moreover, by being made Man he is the more fit to be our King and our Judge. There may be Variety of Purposes served by one Constitution, if I may so call it; and this gives us Occasion to adore the Wisdom and Prudence wherein God hath abounded

towards us in and by such Dispensation. And certainly we are not to make one View or one End to overthrow another, especially when God himself declares that he had such View and Design, This would be great Weakness at best.

And truly, according to the View the Scripture seems to give us, this (I mean his *dying for us*) hath the Appearance of being the main End of the Son of God's taking our Nature. ° The other
Parts

° The late excellent Dr. *Clarke* was plainly of this Mind, and hath express'd himself very particularly to this Purpose, Vol. 5. Serm, 9. p. 203, " Christ hath
" vindicated the Honour of God's Laws, by taking
" upon himself the Punishment of their Sins, who re-
" pent and embrace the Terms of the Gospel. He
" condescended to be made Sin for us, i. e. to be made
" a Sacrifice for our Sins, that we through that Ex-
" piation might become Subjects capable of the Mercy
" of God. He took upon him our Nature, and was
" clothed in Flesh, partly indeed that he might preach
" the Will of God to Mankind in a nearer and more
" condescending Conversation with them; but *prin-*
" *cipally*, that he who in the Form of God could not
" suffer, might become capable of suffering by being
" made in the likeness to Man. He lived a most inno-
" cent and spotless Life, that he might indeed set us an
" Example, that we should follow his Steps; but *chiefly*,
" because as it was required that the typical Sacrifices
" under the Law should be whole and without blemish,
" so it was necessary, that he who was to be the real
" expiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of others, should have
" none that needed Expiation of his own——He suf-
" fer'd a shameful and ignominious Death upon the
" Cross, that he might indeed give us an example of
" Patience and Readiness to suffer; but the *principal*
" *Design* of it was, that he might put away Sin by the
" Sacrifice of himself, and obtain eternal Redemption
" for us through Faith in his Blood. His Resurrection
" was

Parts of his Ministration might (as we may suppose) have been, at least in some good Measure, answer'd by some other Messenger from Heaven : But the *Writer to the Hebrews* seems to represent it as a Thing necessary in Order to the taking away of Sin, that Christ should offer himself unto God ; and consequently we are led to conceive of this as the main Design of his Humiliation and Suffering ; so far from being taught to look upon his Death as an accidental Thing, or as a mere natural Consequence of what he did as a Prophet. This might lead us to consider what the Scripture intimates of the *Necessity* of Christ's dying for us ; which Enquiry I had design'd to have pursu'd in this Place : But I think it is not very material to our present Purpose. Be it so, that we could see no Necessity for Christ's dying as a Sacrifice, or that God did not see fit to tell us that there was any Necessity for it ; this certainly would not in the least alter the Sense of the plain Declarations he hath made of his having appointed it ; or lessen the Credit of such Declarations. Tho' on the other hand, if there be Intimations in Scripture that God thought it becoming him to insist on the having such a Sacrifice offer'd for the making Reconciliation, this may be reckon'd as a strengthening the other positive Declarations of the Fact ; or as a farther Confirmation of the true Sense of such Declarations. And I am clearly of the Mind that the Scripture hath not been altogether silent

“ was the Demonstration of this Sacrifice's being accepted by God ; and his Ascension into Heaven, was in Order to plead the Merits of his Sufferings before God, and intercede for those, who according to the Terms of the Gospel Covenant should be capable of receiving the gracious Benefits purchased by his Death.”

as

as to this Point also. But this may more properly come under Consideration hereafter.

What hath been said, may, I think be abundantly sufficient to let us into the Sense of the sacred Writers with Relation to the Matters we propos'd to consider. And now I would ask any one who hath taken an impartial View of what hath been laid before him, whether he can think the Amount of all to be no more than the Account Mr. *Chubb* gives us in his *Discourse concerning Reason with Regard to Religion and divine Revelation*, p. 20. "Men are said to be sharers in the Benefits of Christ's Death, only by a Figure of Speech, as being sharers in the Benefits of that divine Mission which he laid down his Life to maintain." Let any one judge, whether Mr. *Chubb's* Account of the Matter, or the Representation Dr. *Clarke* gives us of the Death of Christ as a "true Expiatory Sacrifice and Satisfaction for the Sins of the World," (*Exposition of Catechism*, p. 75. p. 302. *Serm. passim*) be the more genuine and natural Import of the several Passages of Scripture that have been produc'd.

C H A P. II.

What Notion we are to frame of Christ's making Atonement by his Death, and of his Priesthood, from the Scriptures before cited. The Notion the Scripture gives us of these Things consistent with the Dictates of Reason and natural Religion.

WE have produc'd several Passages of Scripture that speak of Christ's Death as a Sacrifice, and declare him to be constituted an High Priest;

Priest; and have establish'd, as appears to me beyond all reasonable Doubt, the *literal* Sense of those Scriptures. We may proceed now to consider more distinctly what we are to understand by this Representation of Christ's Death, and what we are to expect from him as being really the High Priest of our Profession.

For the clearing these Matters, it seems the most natural Method we can proceed in, to consider what was the Notion of expiatory Sacrifices, and of the priestly office under the *Law of Moses*. For the *Writer to the Hebrews*, undoubtedly goes upon those Principles in laying down the Doctrine of Christ's Priesthood: Yea, and expressly says, that those Institutions were Shadows and Figures of the Sacrifice, and of the Priesthood of Christ. And the Design of his Epistle, is to convince those *Hebrews* that the Death of Christ was a better Sacrifice, and that he was a more excellent Priest, than any were under the Law.

It is highly probable that Sacrifices had their Original from divine Institution immediately after the Fall. It is hard to account for the Rise of them, and their having so universally obtain'd among Men in all Nations of the World and in all Generations, but upon this Supposition. Be that as it will; by the *Law of Moses* we have express divine Institution, and thence we may see what was the Meaning of them, what God design'd them to signify, and for what Ends they were appointed.^p There

^p It is thought an Observation of some Weight with respect to the Point here consider'd "that we meet
" with no Intimation of any expiatory Sacrifice till
" the Law of *Moses*. There were eucharistical Sacrifices
" very early: And Sacrifices were early used as Rites to

con-

There we find that the Sacrifices were to be of such Sort of Creatures as God chose for this Purpose

“ confirm any Covenant, and probably they were appointed by God for these Purposes. And if these were appointed by God, and repeatedly thus offer’d by good Men under the patriarchal Dispensation, it seems to have no favourable Aspect on the Necessity of expiatory Sacrifices, that God never appointed them, nor the repenting Children of Men ever offered any of them, till *Moses’s* political Constitution was erected.” There not being an express mention of expiatory Sacrifices before the Law of *Moses*, is no Proof that there were none. Or if it were certain that there really were none; neither would that be an Objection against Christ’s Death, being such, or against the plain Sense of any Passage in the New Testament, which declares it to be so. I add; neither would this have so *unfavourable an Aspect*, as is suppos’d upon the Necessity of Christ’s making Atonement by the Sacrifice of himself: That might be necessary, and yet no Necessity of there being other Sacrifices appointed previous to it; tho’ these having been appointed, as we know they were under the Law of *Moses*, we may see Wisdom in such an Institution. There is no Account of the *Institution* of any Sacrifices before the Law; tho’ it is highly probable there was from the beginning a positive Institution. Possibly the less Notice was taken of this, because the complete System, as I may call it, of sacrificing, was to be given to the People of *Israel* upon their commencing a Nation separate from the rest of the World. However, it is enough that the Writers of the New Testament, plainly refer to that Institution, when they represent Christ’s Death as a Sacrifice: The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* expressly doth so. There is no mention made of the Patriarchs keeping the Sabbath, tho’ it is very likely they did observe it. And we have one Custom occasionally mention’d without any Account of its Origin; which

pose, and all the Rites to be used were prescribed by God; he who brought the Offering was to put his

which yet one would think must have been from a positive Command: I refer to the *raising up Seed to a Brother* in the History of *Judab's Sons*. I hint these Things to shew, that it is not a sufficient Foundation for concluding, that there were no expiatory Sacrifices before *Moses*, because the History is silent about them. But perhaps the Fact is not so. Some interpret the Words of God to *Cain*, *Gen. iv. 7.* thus; "If thou hast not done well, a Sacrifice for Sin is at hand." And truly this Sense seems to suit much better with the Context than our rendring; *If thou doest not well, Sin lieth at the Door.* It looks a little odd, methinks, that God should tell him, that in not doing well he sinned; and that upon this God should immediately add a Confirmation of his Superiority over his Brother, *unto thee shall be his Desire, &c.* Taking the foregoing Words in the other Sense, these seem to come in very properly, "thou may'st yet make thy Peace, and if so, thou shalt yet have the Pre-eminence, *unto thee shall be his Desire*" — And what must we think of *Job's* sacrificing for his Sons? It is indeed called a Burnt-offering, which he offered for every one in particular; but it's plain the Sacrifice had a Reference to Sin, and was consider'd as a means of expiating their Guilt. Surely it cannot be reckon'd an *eucharistical* Sacrifice, nor was it any Confirmation of a Covenant; *Job sent and sanctified them, and offered Burnt offerings according to the Number of them all: For Job said, it may be, they have sinned and cursed God in their Hearts.* See also the Command of God to *Job's* Friends. Truly it seems to me that in the very Notion of Sacrifice there was a Respect to Sin; it ever imply'd an Acknowledgment of what the Sinner had deserved. Thus concerning the first offering mention'd in the Levitical Law; tho' it is expressly called a Burnt-offering, and was voluntary; it's said, *He shall lay his Hand upon the Burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him, to make Atonement for him.* But, as I said before, 'tis but reasonable

his Hand upon the Head of the Offering, and then it was to be slain before the Lord ; and the Blood being sprinkled by the Priest, or put upon the Altar according to the Rules prescribed, the *Offering was accepted for the Person to make Atonement for him*, (Levit. Chap. i.) The laying the Hand upon the Head of the Offering and then slaying it before the Lord, seems naturally to signify that the Beast was slain in the room and stead of the Person that offer'd it: I think this was the Notion Men generally had of expiatory Sacrifice. It is true the same Ceremony was used in presenting the Burnt-offering, which was voluntary, and not requir'd upon Account of any particular Transgression ; but we may suppose that in those Offerings also this was design'd to be as an Acknowledgment that the Person had deserved to die ; and God would have this Acknowledgment made in all their solemn Approaches to him : It is remarkable that even of such an Offering it is said, *it shall be accepted for him, to make Atonement for him*, (Lev. i. 4.) and 2 Sam. xxiv. ult.

But let us consider more particularly the Effect of the Sacrifices which were offer'd for Sin, with regard to the Person that offer'd them. As to this Point the Law is very clear and express, they *made Atonement for him*: i. e. By the Appointment of God these were of avail to free him from the Guilt he had contracted, and to prevent the Punishment he was liable to. (See Lev. Ch. iv.)—*He shall bring*

reasonable that we take our Notion of Sacrifices from the Institution the Jews were under ; and which the Writers of the New Testament manifestly have respect unto, and which the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* expressly declares to have been design'd as a Pre-figuration of Christ.

his

his Offering for the Sin which he hath sinned—and the Priests shall make an Atonement for the Sin which he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him: And the Blood of the Sin-Offering is said to be brought into the Tabernacle of the Congregation to reconcile withal. (Chap. vi. ult.) That this is the meaning of the making Atonement, viz. the procuring Forgiveness, or averting those Effects of the divine Displeasure which they were exposed to, is very plain from the two following Passages, Numb. viii. 19. It's said of the Levites, that God had given them to do the Service of the Children of Israel in the Tabernacle of the Congregation, to make an Atonement for the Children of Israel, that there be no Plague among the Children of Israel, when they came nigh unto the Tabernacle. And in a particular Case, when Wrath was gone out against the People, it's said that Aaron going with the Incense and Fire from off the Altar, and standing between the living and the dead, made Atonement for them, and the Plague was stayed, Numb. xvi. 46. And whereas there were certain Uncleanesses under the Law, which were suppos'd to render them unfit to come into the Presence of God, which we may suppose were symbolical Representations of moral Turpitude, which makes a Person really abominable in the sight of God) as the Leprosy, in particular, besides many others: Some of which excluded even from the Camp of Israel, and not only from the Tabernacle; because they did, as it is expressed, defile the Camp where God walked, and therefore they were to be removed, that God might see no unclean Thing in them, and might not turn away from them, Deut. xxiii. 14. Now as these Defilements excluded them from approaching to God, and that under the severest Penalty, (Numb. xix. 13.) therefore Sacrifices in these Cases are said to cleanse them; and this cleansing is also called Atonement, inasmuch

inasmuch as hereupon they were restored again to the Privilege of drawing nigh unto God, or coming to his Tabernacle (see *Lev. xi. 7. Ch. xiv. 19. Ch. xv.*) From this Account we must, I think, look upon Sacrifices as means appointed by God for freeing them from that Guilt and Uncleanneſs which, according to the Constitution of their Law, expoſed them to ſome Tokens of God's Diſpleaſure, or excluded them from the Privileges of his Houſe and Worſhip; yea, and theſe were made the Conditions of their obtaining Forgiveneſs and a Re-admiſſion to his Preſence; as the Writer to the *Hebrews* obſerves, *Without ſhedding of Blood there was no Remiſſion.*

But neither was it ſufficient that a Man bring his Offering and preſent it before the Lord, and put it to Death; the Law appointed *Prieſts* who were to ſprinkle the Blood round about upon the Altar, &c. (*Levit. iv. 5, 16.*) And it's ſaid, *The Prieſt ſhall make an Atonement for him concerning his Sin,* and it ſhall be forgiven him: So that here was required the Mediation of a Prieſt who was to preſent the Blood of the Sacrifice before the Lord in the Tabernacle. And, indeed, the Prieſts only, were allowed to enter into the Sanctuary. *Numb. xviii. 7. Thou and thy Sons with thee ſhall keep your Prieſt's Office for every Thing of the Altar, and within the Vail; and ye ſhall ſerve, and the Stranger that cometh nigh, ſhall be put to Death.* And into the Holieſt of all none but the *High Prieſt* was admitted, and he himſelf but once a Year; and on that Day the Prieſts themſelves were not allowed ſo much as to come into the Tabernacle of the Congregation till the High Prieſt was come out of the holy Place, and had made Atonement for himſelf, and for his Houſhold, and for all the Congregation of *Israel*. As that annual Atonement was the moſt

most solemn, and the most remarkable Instance of the Priest's transacting for the People, it may deserve our especial Notice. We have the Account of it in *Levit. xvi.* *This shall be a Statute for ever unto you ; in the seventh Month, on the tenth Day of the Month ye shall afflict your Souls——— On that Day shall the Priest make an Atonement for you to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your Sins before the Lord.* In this grand Atonement which the High Priest was to make first for himself, and then for the Sins of the People, he was to enter within the Vail with the Blood of the Sacrifice, and to sprinkle it upon the Mercy-seat, and before the Mercy-seat, seven Times ; in like manner he was to take of the Blood and put it upon the Horns of the Altar, and to sprinkle of the Blood upon it with his Finger seven Times ; and hereby he is said to *cleanse it and ballow it from the Uncleannefs of the Children of Israel ;* as it's said with respect to the holy Place, *He shall make Atonement for the holy Place because of the Uncleannefs of the Children of Israel, and because of their Transgressions in all their Sins :* In fine, upon this Day he is said to *make an Atonement for the holy Sanctuary, and for the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and for the Altar, and for all the Priests of the Congregation.* Here then we see the Office and Business of a Priest, exactly answering to the Account which the *Writer to the Hebrews* gives of it (*Chap. v.* beginning) *Every High Priest taken from among Men, is ordained for Men in Things pertaining to God, that he may offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sin.*

From what hath been recited, we may, I think, have a clear View of the *Levitical Constitution :* Whereas the Law of *Moses* denounced a Curse upon every Transgressor, and excluded from the Tabernacle ; and in some Cases from the very Camp of *Israel*, upon account of several Uncleannefs ;

nesses; and those Sins and Uncleanesses might provoke God to depart from them, or to consume them; God was pleased to appoint Sacrifices to be slain, and the Blood of these Sacrifices to be presented by his Priests; and hereupon to forgive their Sins, and to discharge them from their Uncleaness, and so admit them to his Favour and Presence. By virtue of this Constitution the Sacrifices, and the Blood of them, regularly presented, may properly be said to have the Effects ascribed to them, *i. e.* to atone for Sin, to cleanse and purify those for whom they were offer'd. So the Author to the *Hebrews*, they did *sanctify to the purifying of the Flesh*, (Chap. ix. 13.) *i. e.* they took off that Ceremonial Guilt and Uncleaness. I think this is somewhat more than being bare *Memorials* of God's Readiness to forgive (*vide F. p. 334.*) By the Appointment of God they were Means of cleansing, and were Conditions of their obtaining Forgiveness: What can be more express, *He shall bring an Offering for his Sin which he hath sinned—And the Priest shall make an Atonement for the Sin which he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him.* So with respect to the Leper, *The Priest shall offer the Sin-Offering, and make an Atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his Uncleaness—the Priest shall make an Atonement for him, and he shall be clean* (Lev. xiv. 19, 20.) These Sacrifices did not indeed take away moral Guilt (properly so call'd) nor was it fit they should; they were only *Shadows of good Things to come*, (Heb. x. 1.) they were not designed to make him who did the Service perfect as pertaining to the Conscience, (Heb. ix. 9.) Nay, it was not possible, as the same Writer says, that in this respect they should take away Sins, (Chap. x. 4.) But they had a real Efficacy, so far as was fitting, under a Constitution which was design'd to be a Fi-

figure for the Time then present; a Constitution made up of carnal Ordinances, imposed on them till the Time of Reformation, (Heb. ix. 9, 10.) i. e. they did sanctify to the purifying of the Flesh.

This very Thing, v. z. that the legal Sacrifices were not design'd for the taking away moral Guilt, and were not appointed or admitted in case of some particular heinous Offence; this, I say, is a Confirmation of their being design'd and consider'd as somewhat more than bare *Memorials* (vide F. p. 336. 2d. Edit. p. 338. ⁹) where they were appointed or admitted, e. g, when *David* had trans-

⁹ Mr. *Foster* says in his Postscript, " That his only Intention was to shew the wise Ends that might be served by a Sacrifice." It will be to little purpose to enter into a Debate, Whether there was, or was not some Ground for the *Misapprehension of his true Design* in that part of his Discourse. It is a greater Pleasure to me to find that I did misapprehend him where he appeared to me to be in the wrong, than to vindicate myself in understanding him as I did; [only let me say, that I did not imagine, " That he thought the Word *Sacrifice* " to signify strictly a *Memorial*, as if the Ideas were " exactly the same, so that *Sacrifices* were useful *Memorials*, and every useful *Memorial* a *Sacrifice*."] And if I did not perceive, " That he went all along upon " the Supposition, that the first and most obvious Sense " of those Texts [*he put away Sins by the Sacrifice of himself, gave his Life a Ransom for many*, and the like] " is that by the wise Appointment of God we are to " consider the Death of Christ, as the Thing upon the " Account of which he pardons Sin, and confers Life " and Immortality upon us:" I am pleased to hear him say now, " That the All-wise Governor of the World " thought fit to fix upon this Method of pardoning " Sin; and in this Way only to declare his accepting " his guilty Creatures upon their Repentance, and reward their sincere, though imperfect Virtue."

gressed

gressed in the Matter of *Uriab*, God mercifully forgave him: *Natban* said unto him, *The Lord hath put away thy Sin; thou shalt not die.* Now if all the Uses that 'twas possible in Reason for Sacrifices to serve are these two, viz. *Keeping up a firm Belief of God's Reconcilableness, and being ready to forgive*——and at the same Time a strong Sense of the Evil of Sin, and their own Demerit upon account of it; (F. p. 334.) certainly in such a Case as this they were more especially useful and proper. Here if at any Time, or in any Case, was need of some Testimony of God's readiness to forgive: Here it would be proper, one would think, to make use of these Means of impressing a strong Sense of the Evil of Sin, and his Demerit upon account of it. Were these the only Uses Sacrifices could serve for, it appears to me altogether unaccountable, that in such a Case, where was most occasion for such Uses, no Sacrifice should be appointed or allow'd of: *Thou desirest not Sacrifice,* says the royal Penitent, *else would I give it.* No; upon such Occasions the Sacrifices of God, what he requir'd to be presented to him; all that could be made use of by the Sinner in order to the obtaining Forgiveness, was to bring a *broken and a contrite Heart.* This shews, I think very plainly, that Sacrifices, where they were admitted, were understood to serve some other purpose, *i. e.* they were consider'd as actual Atonements, as means of freeing them from actual Guilt; which indeed is very express in the Law; and every Person offering his Sacrifice according to the Rules, was by the Constitution freed from the Guilt or Pollution he before lay under, as much as he who had contracted none. And being design'd to make Atonement only in Cases of ceremonial Guilt or Uncleanesses; or at most in some Instances of political Guilt, we see the Reason why they could have no Place in other Cases; but *Memorials* they might certainly have

have been in those other Cases, to as good Purpose, yea, one would think, with much greater Advantage.

In this Constitution we see a Dispensation of Mercy, yet in such a way as carried with it a lively Display of the Divine Purity, and might serve to maintain in the Worshippers an awful Sense of the Desert of Sin, and of God's Abhorrence of it. He came to dwell among them, and he dwelt upon a Mercy-seat, and all their Worship was directed thither; but they were not to approach even the Mercy-Seat but through the Mediation of an High Priest; nor must the High Priest himself come into the holy Place where God was suppos'd to have his special Residence without the Blood of Sacrifices, which Blood is expressly declared to be for an *Atonement, because of the Uncleanneſs of the Children of Israel, and because of their Transgressions in their Sins.* In this View we may see now Sacrifices were a proper Expiation, or a real Propitiation; not that they were the Cause of a merciful Disposition in God, and in that Sense *render'd him propitious* who was before implacable. I entirely agree with Mr. F. that in this respect *proper Expiations* they neither were nor could be. No, this Disposition, yea, and Resolution to shew Mercy, is the first Thing suppos'd. God determines to make them his People, yea, a *Kingdom of Priests that they might come nigh unto him*; he assures them that he will dwell among them, and for this purpose erects a *Mercy-seat*. But then, that he might at the same Time keep up a due Sense of his absolute *Purity*, he requires of all that approach to this Mercy-seat, being Sinners and polluted, that they come in this Way, *viz. by the Blood of Sacrifices* offered to him by the Priest whom he had ordained; and without this they were to expect

pect no Mercy at the Hands of God, but on the contrary the Effects of his Displeasure. So that it might very justly and properly be said according to this Constitution, Sacrifices procur'd their Pardon, they were an Expiation; or, that the Priests by offering those Sacrifices according to the Appointment, obtained from the Mercy of God those Blessings which otherwise they must have been deprived of.

I presume every one will readily perceive how the Effects attributed to the *Blood of Christ* correspond with those Effects of the Sacrifices which we have mention'd; and his acting as our *High Priest* answers to the Office of the High Priest under the Law. The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* hath set forth this Correspondence and Resemblance, in a very clear and beautiful Manner, throughout his Epistle; only observing at the same Time the vastly superior Excellency of Christ's Ministry. But some have insinuated, that that Writer may be suppos'd to represent Christ's Death, and his acting, in such a View, only to accommodate himself to their received Notions: That is to say (for indeed I can make no better of it) that this Correspondence is all his own Invention, and there was no such Thing originally design'd. Besides what hath been said before of this Matter, I would here particularly observe, how abundantly such Insinuation is confuted by the *Epistle* itself. I shall therefore beg leave to lay before the Reader several Passages wherein that Author directly asserts the contrary, Chap. viii. *We have such an High Priest who is set on the right Hand of the Throne of the Majesty in the Heavens, a Minister of the Sanctuary, and the TRUE Tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not Man—There are Priests that offer Gifts according to the Law, who serve according*

to the **EXAMPLE** and **SHADOW** of heavenly Things. Chap. ix. 8, &c. *The Holy Ghost* this signifying, that the way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first Tabernacle was yet standing, which was a **FIGURE** for the Time then present, in which were offered both Gifts and Sacrifices that could not make him that did the Service perfect as pertaining to the Conscience—But Christ being come, an High Priest of good Things to come, by a **GREATER** and more **PERFECT** Tabernacle not made with Hands—Neither by the Blood of Bulls and Goats, but by his own Blood he enter'd in once into the holy Place, having obtained eternal Redemption for us—Ver. 23. It was therefore necessary that the **PATTERNS** of Things in the Heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly Things themselves with better Sacrifices than these. For Christ is not enter'd into the holy Places made with Hands, which are the **FIGURES** of the **TRUE**, but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the Presence of God for us. Once more, Chap. x. 1. For the Law having a **SHADOW** of good Things to come, and not the very Image of the Things, can never with those Sacrifices which they offer'd Year by Year continually make the Comers thereunto perfect. Can it be thought the Man who speaks thus meant to call Christ's Death a Sacrifice, or to call Christ a Priest, only in a figurative, allusive Sense. as he calls our Praises and Thanksgivings Sacrifices? No; his Sentiments appear to be diametrically opposite, the very reverse of this. The Objectors would insinuate that he speaks of Christ, and what he hath done, in such manner, only to accommodate himself to the Notions those *Hebrews* had of the need of Sacrifices, &c. whereas this Author represents the whole *Levitical Constitution* as framed with a View to what was to be accomplish'd afterwards in and by our Saviour. Their Institutions were design'd as *Shadows* of the good Things

E

which

which were to come by Jesus Christ; their Ministry in the Tabernacle was a *Figure* for the Time then present; Christ ministers in the Sanctuary and the *true* Tabernacle; their Ordinances were *Patterns*, what Christ was to perform was the great Exemplar.

I might observe, that St. *Paul* had the same Notion of the Ceremonial Observances under the Law, Col. ii. 17. *Which Things are a Shadow of Things to come, but the Body is of Christ.* And, what if I should say, that our Lord himself hath intimated as much? What else can be the Meaning of those Words, Luke xxii. 16. *I say unto you, I will no more eat of the Passover, until it be FULFILLED in the Kingdom of God.* And I cannot help thinking, that the Types of the Law were among the *Things found in Moses concerning him*; which Christ explained to the Disciples after his Resurrection; for the Things he then insisted on concerning himself seem to have been principally, if not only, the Things relating to his Sufferings, and the Consequences thereof; and I think we cannot find much in *Moses* relating to the Sufferings of Christ, unless we suppose the legal Sacrifices to refer to him. See Luke xxiv. 26—44, &c. How did the *Law prophecy*? For Christ says, *The Law* as well as the Prophets *did prophecy until John*, Matt. xi. 13. And

“ Which [speaking of the Expiatory Sacrifice under the Law] if it was intended for a Type of Christ
 “ (as the Apostle to the *Hebrews* largely shews, and as
 “ the whole Nature of the Law abundantly declares)
 “ nothing can be more unreasonable, than to make the
 “ Substance less real than the Shadow, to make the
 “ Death of Christ less truly expiatory than the Sacri-
 “ fices that were merely Types and Representations of
 “ it.” Dr. *Clarke's* Sermon upon the Sufferings of
 Christ, Vol. VIII. p. 367.

And did not the *Evangelist* understand the Law to prophesy by its Types, when he observes, upon occasion of the Soldiers breaking the Legs of the two Malefactors, and not breaking Christ's Legs, because he was already dead; that *these Things were done that the Scriptures should be fulfilled; A Bone of him shall not be broken.* The Words in the *Evangelist* come much nearer to the Words in *Exod. xii. 46. Numb. ix. 12.* than to the Words in *Psalms xxxiv. 20.* to which some would refer them; (not to observe, that it may be as hard perhaps to make out that Passage in the Psalm to be a Prophecy of Christ, as to make out the other to be a Type.) Now in both these Texts refer'd to in the Law we have this express Order given concerning the Paschal Lamb, that they should not break a Bone thereof: Nor is any Reason given for it, nor do I suppose that any Account can be given, why that should be so particularly insisted on, but this of its being design'd as a Type of the Lamb of God, who was to take away the Sins of the World; and whom God design'd in so remarkable a Manner to preserve from having a Bone of his broken, when the two Malefactors, crucified on each side of him, had their Bones broken.

It is not very material for us to enquire, what Light the ancient *Israelites* might have in this Matter? I shall only say, that it is very possible they might have some Hints which have not come down to us; possibly these might be among those wondrous Things contain'd in the Law, which *David* pray'd that God would open his Eyes to behold, *Psalms cxix. 18.* It is certain they were fully appriz'd that some of the *Psalms* belong'd to the Messiah. When our Lord put that Question to the Scribes, *How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord?* They pretend not to dispute the Applica-

tion of the Words, though they knew not what to answer; whence it appears that it was well known and universally allow'd, that the *Psalm* spake of the Messiah. *St. Peter* assures us, that the Prophets did understand that Christ was to suffer, though their Apprehensions were but dark; and they knew that they were not to expect that clear Insight into their own Prophecies, as those should have who should believe in Christ after his coming. See 1 *Pet.* i. 10, &c. But should we suppose that they knew nothing of the matter, yet such a previous Adumbration might be of use to them: That People from whom the Messiah was to come being train'd up in this Way of receiving Mercy, viz. by the Mediation of a Priest, and by the Atonement of a Sacrifice, were prepared for the Reception of the Gospel Doctrine, concerning the Redemption of the World through the Blood of Christ. And the exact Correspondence between those Types, and what we have seen accomplished in Christ, may be of use to us; even as the Prophecies which the Prophets themselves had but little understanding of. But to return,

Let us see now what are the Effects ascribed to the Death of Christ as a Sacrifice, and what are the Benefits which result from his acting as a Priest for us. The New Testament is, as I may say, full of these Matters, as we have seen by what hath been cited in the former Chapter. I hope the Reader will not think much to have some Passages of Scripture brought again into View under this Head: *We are reconciled unto God by the Death of his Son. We are justified by his Blood. He hath delivered us from the Curse, by his having been made a Curse for us. We are brought nigh, who were far off, by the Blood of Christ. He hath made Peace by the Blood of his Cross. His Blood purgeth*

purgeth the Conscience from dead Works. We are sanctified through the Offering of the Body of Christ. By that one Offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, i. e. hath purged them, that they should have no more Conscience of Sins (vide Heb. x. beginning) He hath put away Sins by the Sacrifice of himself. His Blood cleanseth from all Unrighteousness. He hath washed us from our Sins in his own Blood. Here are variety of Expressions; and let it be observed, all these have plainly reference to Sins past, or to the Effects and Consequences of Sins committed; and do not at all relate to the preventing Sin for the Time to come; though this was undoubtedly the End of our Redemption, as is abundantly declared; but I say those Effects we have mentioned do plainly relate to the Guilt or Pollution contracted by Sin; which are represented as done away by the Blood of Christ. Having shed his Blood he enter'd into the holy Place, as the *Writer to the Hebrews* expresses it; by or with his own Blood he entered into Heaven, to appear in the Presence of God for us, ministering in that true Sanctuary, where he ever lives to make Intercession.

This last Particular, his making Intercession, some think can by no means be understood in a literal Sense. I don't suppose that these *Hebrews* would understand by Christ's ever living to make Intercession, that he is continually putting up *vocal Prayer* for us. The High Priest by *entering into the holy Place, and there presenting the Blood of the Sacrifice*, made Atonement, and obtained Blessings for the People. We don't read of any Form of Prayer prescribed, or any Order for his putting up any direct Prayer upon this Occasion, nor any Hint of his doing so: His appearing before God with the Incense, and sprinkling the Mercy-seat

with the Blood of the Sacrifice, was, as far as we have any Account of the Matter, his making Intercession. And truly it is somewhat remarkable, that upon this solemn Occasion there should be no mention made of the High Priest's putting up a Prayer to God (which would seem very natural to expect) one would think that was omitted on purpose, that it might be a more exact Pattern of Christ's appearing in the Presence of God for us. Now, in as much as Christ hath an unchangeable Priesthood, and being once enter'd into the holy Place, continues there, always appearing in the Presence of God, *he ever lives*, as the Epistle hath it, *to make Intercession*; just as the High Priest, when he was enter'd into the holy Place, and so long as he continued there, might be said to be making Intercession for the People. But to proceed;

To Christ's executing this Office of a Priest we owe our Freedom of Access to God now, the Acceptance of our Persons and our Services, and our Admittance hereafter into the holy Place, where he is; and we are in Consequence of this directed to *come to God by him*, and to *offer up* our Services by him. *He hath made us accepted in the Beloved*; *ἐξαγαγὼν ἡμᾶς*, hath treated us as Persons highly favoured (*ἐξαίρεσις καὶ ἐξαγαγόμενοι*, Luke i. 28. the Angel's Salutation to the blessed Virgin) *In Christ Jesus we are made nigh through the Blood of Christ. Through him we have an Access by the Spirit unto the Father. In him we have Boldness and Access with Confidence by the Faith of him. Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God — let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace. This Man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable Priesthood; wherefore he is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God*

God by him; seeing that he over liveth to make Intercession for them. Having therefore, Brethren, boldness to enter into the Holiest. by the Blood of Jesus; by a new and living Way which he hath consecrated for us, through the Vail, that is to say, his Flesh; and having an High Priest over the House of God, let us draw near in full Assurance of Faith, having our Hearts sprinkled from an evil Conscience. Jesus, that he might sanctify the People with his own Blood, suffer'd without the Gate—By him therefore let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually. Ye are a holy Priesthood, to offer up spiritual Sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. If any Man sin we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. To him that loved us, and washed us from our Sins — and hath made us Priests unto God and his Father. Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy Blood, and hast made us to our God Priests. These are the Blessings and Benefits we receive through Christ as our High Priest, and such is the Use we are to make of him, or rather, I should say, such are the Regards we are to pay to him under that Character, and as invested in that Office.

Here I would have it specially remark'd, that our Pardon and Acceptance with God, and our Freedom of Access, are represented as being the Fruit of his SUFFERING. Some have been willing to represent Christ's procuring these Blessings for us merely as a Consequence of his acceptable Obedience: *i. e.* " God was so highly pleased with
 " his becoming obedient unto Death; this gives
 " him such an Interest in the Favour of God, that
 " now upon his Account, and for his Sake, God
 " is willing to bestow these Blessings upon unworthy Creatures, they being, as we may say, recommended by him, *i. e.* all who comply with
 " the

“ the Terms he proposes.” This, I think, comes far short of the View the Scripture gives us of Christ’s officiating as a *Priest*. The Priest was to make Atonement by the *Blood* of the Sacrifice ; it was an essential Part of his Office, according to the Definition the Writer to the *Hebrews* gives of it, *to offer Sacrifices for Sin* ; and the High Priest enter’d not into the holy Place *without Blood* ; so Christ, as this Writer observes, *by his own Blood entered into Heaven*, &c. Accordingly we find these Blessings we receive through Christ every where directly ascribed to the *Blood of Christ* ; or represented as the Fruit of his Death, as may be seen in the Passages cited above. It is true, Christ’s giving up himself unto Death, even the Death of the Cross, in compliance with the Will of the Father, was a most glorious Instance of Obedience ; so the Apostle represents it, and tell us, that for this God highly exalted him, &c. And himself says, that for this the *Father loved him*, even because he laid down his Life. And the Scripture seems to attribute to the Merit of this Obedience that Overplus of Glory and Happiness that he will confer upon those that are his. *Father, the Hour is come, glorify thy Son — As thou hast given him Power over all Flesh, that he should give eternal Life —* : This is more than bare Reconciliation or Atonement. That is every where ascribed to his Death, and that plainly consider’d as SUFFERING, not as an Act of Obedience, of which Consideration there is not the least Hint in several of the Passages where his Death is mention’d as the procuring Cause of our Pardon and Peace : *e. g.* the purging our Consciences from dead Works is ascribed to the Blood of Christ, just in the same Manner as the purifying the unclean under the Law was ascribed to the Blood of the Sacrifice ; *Heb. ix. 14.* That Writer’s Discourse in the latter End of that Chap-

Chapter, seems very exprefs to this purpose, and puts it out of doubt, that it was the shedding his Blood, suffering of Death, that procur'd Remission : *Without shedding of Blood there is no Remission — Christ is enter'd into Heaven it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us — Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High Priest enter'd into the holy Place every Year with the Blood of others, for then must he often have suffer'd since the Foundation of the World ; but now once in the End of the World hath he appeared to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.* I think it very plain from thence, that it was the Suffering Death that was consider'd as the Sacrifice for Sin, or that whereby he was to put away Sin ; not merely his Obedience in yielding to Death, *Heb. iii. 10, 11.* And this perfectly agrees with the Account we have in Scripture of *God's laying upon him our Iniquities, of his bearing our Sins in his own Body on the Tree, of his being delivered for our Offences, and God's not sparing him, of his being made Sin for us, being made a Curse for us ;* which carry no respect at all to an Act of Obedience in him, but directly lead us to consider him as suffering upon account of our Sins. And it is evident that in the Sacrifice, as such, there could be no Respect had to Obedience, but only to the shedding the Blood, or the suffering Death in the room of the Offender ; this is plainly express'd in the Reason given for that strict Prohibition against eating any Manner of Blood, *for the Life of the Flesh is in the Blood, and I have given it to you upon the Altar to make an Atonement for your Souls : For it is the Blood that maketh an Atonement for the Soul, Lev. xvii 11.* Nor was it the Obedience of the High-Priest, but his presenting the Blood of the Sacrifice that made the Atonement. The Reader

will perceive presently the Reason of my insisting so particularly on this.

But I must not overlook one remarkable Passage, which I think is the only one in the New Testament, where the Grace we receive through Christ is ascribed to his *Obedience*, and therefore may seem to interfere with what we have said. The Place I refer to is in *Rom. v.* where the *Apostle* hath these very Words, *by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous.* Here it is to be consider'd, the *Apostle* is drawing a Parallel between the first and second *Adam*, and he observes, that as the first brought in Death by *one Offence*, so the second *Adam* brought in Righteousness and Life, by *one Act of Obedience.* It was very natural for the *Apostle* (who seems to delight in Antitheses, which are frequent in his Writings) to represent it in such Manner: Here is the *second Adam* answering to the *first Adam*: Here is *ἡ δικαιοσύνη* one righteous Act by means of which Grace came upon all to *Justification of Life*, answering to *ἡ παρανομία* by means of which Sentence came upon all Men to *Condemnation*, (Ver. 18.) This *ἡ δικαιοσύνη* was no doubt his giving himself up unto Death, whereby Righteousness and Life were brought in; just as the one Transgression of *Adam* in eating the forbidden Fruit, was that which brought the Condemnation of Death upon all Mankind. But doth this deny that Christ's Death was consider'd as a Sacrifice, or as a Suffering for Sin? The most that can be made of it is, that the *Apostle* here is silent about that Matter, he doth not represent the Death of Christ in that View upon this Occasion. Surely this can be no Prejudice to other Texts which do give us that Representation of it, and that in the strongest and most direct Manner that can be

be *. Not to observe that in this very *Epistle*, the *Apostle* had before plainly enough given this View of it; e. g. when he says, *God had set forth Christ a Propitiation in his Blood*, (Chap. iii. ver. 25) that he *was delivered for our Offences*, (Chap. iv. ult.) and in this very Chap. that *when we were Enemies he died for us*; and *we are justified by his Blood*; *reconciled unto God by his Death*. Is it reasonable, that the Multitude of Texts we meet with in the New Testament which speak plainly to this Purpose, should be stript of their most natural Sense and Import, and be made in a manner unintelligible, only to bring them to Accommodation with this; which yet may be fairly accounted for without the least interfering with them? For besides what hath been offer'd, I desire it may be farther observ'd, that the *Apostle* here takes in the whole of the Salvation we have by *Christ*, in Opposition to the Misery that we became liable to by the first Man's Transgression: And consequently it was fit he should represent the Way wherein *Christ* procured this, in such Manner as might justly answer to

* It hath been objected, " That here I seem to be
 " for explaining a plain literal Expression by figurative
 " and symbolical Representations; whereas so may
 " 200 of these should rather be explained by one plain
 " and clear Expression, such as this of *Christ's Obedi-*
 " *ence* is" I do allow *Christ's Obedience* here spoken
 of to be understood *literally*; but this doth not exclude
 or set aside what is said in other Places concerning his
 Suffering and Death: And the Expressions concerning
 these latter are no less plain and easy to be understood
 in the *literal Sense*, than that Expression in the vth of
Rom. e. g. that *we have Forgiveness of Sins through the*
Blood of Christ. That *he made Peace through the Blood*
of his Cross; that *he died for our Sins*, and the like;
 these, I say, are no more *figurative*, and are as plain
 when literally taken, as that of *our being made Righte-*
ous by the Obedience of Christ.

to or suit with the whole of the Benefit. Now as we hinted before, tho' our Reconciliation, or the reinstating us in the Favour of God, is directly ascribed to the Death of Christ as a Sacrifice; yet that *Abundance of Grace and of the Gift of Righteousness which was to reign in Life by one, Jesus Christ*, as the Apostle expresses himself, Ver. 17. could not perhaps so justly be attributed to the shedding his Blood as a Sacrifice; but might properly be ascribed to the *one righteous Act*, which was so highly pleasing to God, for which the Father loved him, for which he so highly exalted him, and gave him Power to confer all that Happiness and Glory upon those that are his; which righteous Act was the giving himself up to the Death, the giving himself a Sacrifice. Let me add as a Confirmation of the Distinction we have made between the immediate Effects of the Death of Christ as a Sacrifice, which we have suppos'd to be only Peace and Reconciliation, and that eternal Life and complete Happiness which is also contained in the Salvation we have through Christ; that the Apostle seems plainly to make this Distinction, Ver. 10. Of this Chap. *If while we were Enemies we were reconciled to God by the Death of his Son: How much more being reconciled shall we be saved by his Life.* Upon the whole I am satisfied that the Apostle's expressing himself in this Manner in this Account he gives of the Resemblance between the first and second Adam, &c. *As by one Man's Disobedience many were made Sinners; so by the Obedience of one shall many be made righteous*; can by no means overturn the Sense of those many Passages, which so plainly ascribe our Reconciliation to the Death of Christ, consider'd as a *Suffering* upon our Account, and which make the shedding his Blood the Atonement of our Guilt. I have been so particular in endeavouring to settle this Matter to make my

my Way clearer to what I am now going to observe ; viz.

As in the legal Institutions we have seen a Dispensation of Mercy in such Way, as might at the same time carry with it a lively Demonstration of the Holiness of God, and his Regard to the Sanctions of his Law ; so in this Way of our Redemption by the Death of Christ, and of our Access to God by him as our High-priest, here is a Dispensation of Mercy, attended with a most affecting Display of the absolute Purity of his Nature, of his Abhorrence of Sin, and a Regard to the righteous Sanction of the original Law which denounced Death to the Transgressors of it.

Surely it cannot be denied that the Death of Christ is a Demonstration of God's Displeasure against Sin, when God himself tells us, that *he was wounded for our Transgressions, and bruised for our Iniquities ; that he was delivered for our Offences : i. e.* That Sin was the Cause of all those grievous Sufferings he underwent. Can it be denied that here is a very lively display of the absolute Purity of the divine Nature, when even penitent Sinners shall not be admitted to come nigh but through a Mediator, and we must have so great an High-priest to appear in the Presence of God for us ; when even those who do walk in the Light, as God is in the Light, yet being imperfect cannot have fellowship with him, without being *cleansed from all Sin by the Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God.*

I know it hath been said, “ where doth the
“ Scripture represent Christ's Death as a Demon-
“ stration of the Righteousness and Holiness of
“ God ; where is it insisted on as a token of his
“ Displeasure against Sin ? ” I should think very
plainly

plainly in the Passages before refer'd to : In short, in every Place where mention is made of his dying for Sin, and where this is propos'd as the great Encouragement to us in our Approaches unto God. I grant, it is not propos'd to us under this Consideration, (I mean as a Demonstration of God's Displeasure against Sin) in so direct and explicit a manner, at least not so commonly, as it is propos'd by way of Encouragement, and as an Argument for our Hope of the divine Favour. The immediate Design of the Gospel was to assure Sinners of Acceptance : It is *the Word of Reconciliation*. Men were suppos'd under the Consciousness of Guilt ; and when in any due Manner sensible of that, under the dread of divine Wrath. And indeed it appears, however it were that Men came by such an Apprehension, they were universally possess'd with the Notion, that there must be some Atonement, some Expiation of Guilt. The *Jews* were train'd up in this Perswasion under the Institution of God himself : And the like Perswasion had obtain'd, as far as appears by all History both ancient and modern, almost every where among the Gentiles too. Whence we may conclude by the way, either, that this is a Notion highly agreeable to the Reason of Mankind, or at least to the natural Fears arising from Guilt ; or else, that it was early instill'd into the first Authors of the human Race, and thence derived to their Posterity. However, Men being possess'd with such Apprehensions, the great Business, as I may say, of the Gospel, was to assure Men that God is willing to be at Peace ; to satisfy them, that here is an Atonement provided which they may entirely depend upon. God, says St. Paul, *hath given to us the Ministry of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them ; and hath committed*

ted unto us the *Word of Reconciliation*. Now then we are *Ambassadors for Christ*, as tho' God did beseech you by us, we pray you in *Christ's* stead, be ye reconciled unto God. For he hath made him to be Sin for us, who knew no Sin; that we might be made the *Righteousness of God* in him.

And indeed this very Thing, the laying this as the Foundation of a Sinner's Hope in his Return to God, the proposing the Sacrifice of Christ and his Intercession as a sure Ground of our Acceptance when we come to God by him; doth at first View present to our Thoughts this Consideration, that here is abundant Provision made for the removing that just Displeasure, which the guilty Creature conceives a holy and a righteous God to have against the Transgressors of his Law. When the *Writer to the Hebrews* says, *seeing then we have a great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God, who is passed into the Heavens; let us therefore come boldly to the Throne of Grace* — (see also Chap. vii. 25, &c. Chap. x. 19, &c.) When *St. John* saith, *If any Man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; who is the Propitiation for our Sins; and not for ours only, but for the Sins of the whole World*: Doth not all this suppose a Dread of the divine Justice and Holiness in the Sinner, and the removing this, by assuring him that there is a Propitiation, that we have an Advocate, &c. And how is it that these Things are, or can be propos'd as a Remedy against the Fears of a guilty Creature; how do they operate (if I may so express it) in order to the producing this Effect? Is it not plainly by letting him see, how the Honour of divine Justice and Holiness is secur'd and provided for? and consequently that these can now be no Obstacles to Mercy? So that the very proposing Christ's having died for Sin, and his making
 , Inter-

Intercession for us, as an Encouragement to the Sinner to hope for Mercy, seems plainly to carry this in it; that his dying for Sin was understood to be a vindicating the Honour and Justice of God, at the same Time that he freely forgave Sinners: And the encouraging us to draw nigh in full Assurance of Faith, by the Consideration of our having such an High-priest to appear in the Presence of God for us, doth imply, that by this means God doth maintain his Dignity; and give sufficient Testimony of the absolute Purity of his Nature; the Thoughts of which would otherwise fill the Sinner with Confusion and Dread, whenever he should think of approaching to God.

There is a Passage in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, which I think represents to us, in the most lively Manner that can be, the Purity of the divine Nature, and his utter Aversion to Sin, as display'd in this Way of our being brought nigh to God, Ch. ix. Having mentioned *Moses's* sprinkling with Blood both the Tabernacle and all the Vessels of the Ministry, he observes, that *almost all Things are by the Law purged with Blood; and without shedding of Blood is no Remission.* Now the purging the Tabernacle and the Altar, and the Sanctuary, was the *cleansing them and hallowing them from the Uncleanesses of the Children of Israel*, Lev. xvi. 19. Was not this a Representation of the divine Purity, that he could not, if I may so speak, endure to dwell among them, or bear those Things to be nigh unto him which they had any Thing to do with, without their being purged? The Author goes on, *it was therefore necessary that the Patterns of Things in the Heavens should be purified with these, but the heavenly Things themselves with better Sacrifices than these: For Christ is not enter'd into the holy Places made with Hands, which are the Figures*

Figures of the true; but into Heaven it self, now to appear in the Presence of God for us. Doth not this represent to us, that by reason of our Defilement, God would not endure us to come into the Place where he dwells, had not Christ enter'd with his own Blood to make Atonement, and beforehand appeared in the Presence of God for us? Or rather, I should say, which sets it in a yet stronger Light, and which is indeed the immediate View here presented to us; that God could not endure Heaven itself when we should come into it, unless it were according to the Expression us'd concerning the Tabernacle, &c. *cleansed and hallowed by the Blood of Christ from our Uncleaness.* This I say is the View here presented: *The Patterns of Things in the Heavens were purified with these, i. e. with the Blood of Bulls and Goats, &c. but the heavenly Things themselves were purified with better Sacrifices than these; for Christ is enter'd into Heaven it self—not by the Blood of others, but by his own Blood,* Ver. 12. Is not here a very plain and very lively Representation of Sin as a Defilement, an Uncleaness: and of the utmost Abhorrence of it in the Divine Nature?

But besides this, *St. Paul*, I find, doth directly insist on this Point; if I understand him aright; and sets before us the Redemption we have through Christ in this View, when he is professedly treating of the Way wherein the guilty Creature obtains Righteousness, or Justification. The Place I refer to is in his Epistle to the *Romans*, Chap. iii. having proved that all the World was become guilty before God; so that by the Deeds of the Law no Flesh could be justified in his sight: Now, says he, *the Righteousness of God without Law is manifested, being witnessed by the Law (dia te vovw, by the Law of Moses it self) and the Prophets;* even
the

the Righteousness of God which is by Faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe, for there is no Difference, for all have sinned and come short of the Glory of God; being justified freely by his Grace; he adds, *δια της ἀπολύσεως της ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, If the only View in this way of justifying Sinners was the Exercise of Free Grace, one might be ready to say, What hath the Redemption which is in Christ to do in the Matter? This, at first sight, seems rather to take off from the Freeness of the Grace, or at least to abate the Apprehension of it, than to make any Addition, or give any Lustre to it. However, the Apostle goes on to shew us in a more particular Manner, how this Justification comes upon them that believe through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ. *Him*, says the Apostle, *God hath set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood. Observe what follows, To declare his Righteousness for the Remission of Sins that are past, through the Forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this Time his Righteousness, that he might be just, and the Justifier of every one that believeth in Jesus.* I know *δικαιοσύνη* is suppos'd by some to mean here, *Goodness or Mercy*; but I think we entirely miss the Apostle's Meaning in this Passage if we take it in that Sense, and make what he says here to be of very little significancy. The Words *δικαίω* and *δικαιοσύνη* may perhaps frequently occur in the Septuagint in this Sense, answering to the Hebrew Word which we commonly render *Righteous*, and which in many Places evidently enough intends *good or beneficent*: But I question whether any Instance can be produced out of the Writings of this Apostle, where *δικαίω* or *δικαιοσύνη* must be taken in this Sense. It is observable, that in this very Epistle he uses it in the strict Sense, by way of distinction from *ἀγαθός*, a good Man;

Chap.

Chap. v. 7. Scarcely for a Righteous (or just) Man will one die; yet peradventure for a good Man some would even dare to die. And he had before mention'd *δικαιωμα* *τε* *Θεοῦ*, which we render the *Judgment of God*, (that they which commit such Things are worthy of Death.) I understand therefore *Righteousness*, in the Passage before us, in the proper, strict Sense, as denoting the Regard God hath to that *δικαιωμα* which the Apostle had before spoken of, *Chap. i. ult. viz.* that righteous Sentence of his Law which denounces Death to the Transgressor.

For the farther clearing and establishing this Sense of *δικαιο* and *δικαιοσύνη* in this Discourse, I must take notice of the Words *διὰ τὴν παρὰ τὴν ἀπολύτωση ἀμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τε Θεοῦ*; the true rendring of which will, I apprehend, give great Light to the Apostle's Meaning. As they run in our Translation they seem to me very obscure, and scarcely intelligible, taking Righteousness in either Sense. I think it should be render'd, *because of the Remission of Sins* — I don't conceive that the Remission of Sins — is here consider'd as that in and by which God demonstrated *τὴν δικαιοσύνην*: It would be so indeed, if by *δικαιοσύνη* we must understand Goodness or Mercy; but then I suppose it would have been express'd *διὰ τῆς* or *ἐν τῇ*, as afterwards *ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ*. I rather take this to be represented as a Motive or Reason, why God thought fit, now at this Time, to give this Demonstration of his Righteousness, in setting forth Christ to be a Propitiation in his Blood. The Remission of Sins that were past, *ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τε Θεοῦ*, through the Forbearance of God, or his taking no notice of them, might seem to be a Reflection upon his Justice; now, says the Apostle, he hath set forth Christ to be the Propitiation in his Blood, to manifest his
Justice,

Justice, because of the Remission of the Sins that were past. 'Tis remarkable, how solemnly he insists on this repeating it again, *To declare, I say, at this Time, his Righteousness*, προς ενδειξιν της δικαιοσυνης εν τω νυν καιρω; after the exercising his Forbearance for so many Ages in passing by the Sins of Men, he hath now at length set forth Christ to be a Propitiation — for a Demonstration of his Justice, that he might appear to be just, at the same Time that he is the Justifier of every one that believes in Jesus. According to this Interpretation, I see, methinks, strong Sense, a new Thought, and a farther View and Design of God in taking this Method of justifying Sinners : But understanding it in the other way, *i. e.* taking δικαιοσυνη to mean only Goodness or Mercy, this whole Passage (I hope I may say it without Offence) appears to me comparatively very flat ; I see no more in it than what he had said before, *That we are justified freely by his Grace*; at least nothing that should seem deserving such a solemn Repetition, or inculcating it, *to declare, I say, at this Time his Righteousness*. I am apt to think that reading the whole Passage, according to that Interpretation, would make it appear to any one in the same Manner as it does to me : “ Being
 “ justified freely by his Grace, through the Re-
 “ demption that is in Jesus Christ, whom God
 “ hath set forth to be a Propitiation through Faith
 “ in his Blood ; to declare his *Goodness*, by means
 “ of the Remission of Sins that are past, through
 “ the Forbearance of God ; to declare, I say, at
 “ this Time his *Goodness*, that he might be *Good*,
 “ and the Justifier of every one that believeth in
 “ Jesus.” Would not the Goodness of God have been manifested in justifying Sinners freely by his Grace, though Christ had had no Concern in the Matter ? But when the Apostle adds to our being justified freely by his Grace, that this is through
 the

the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ; that God hath set forth him to be a Propitiation in his Blood, *προς ἰκανήν*, for a Demonstration of his Justice; for a Demonstration of his Justice now, at this Time, because of his having passed by for so long Time the Sins of Men through his Forbearance; here the Expression, *that he might be just, and the Justifier of every one that believes in Jesus*, hath a great Force, as well as a beautiful Antithesis; whereas neither appears, understanding *δικαιοσύνη* to mean Goodness.

The last Verse of this Chapter is, I think a Confirmation of the Sense we have given of *δικαιοσύνη*. *Do we then make void Law (νόμος)* the original Law of God, which requires perfect Obedience, and condemns the Sinner; do we make such Law to signify nothing by our declaring the Righteousness of God through the Faith of Christ? Far from it; we establish such Law; God having demonstrated his Regard to it, in that he doth not justify the Transgressors thereof, but through the Redemption that is in Christ; God having set forth him to be a Propitiation in his Blood. I understand here by *Law* not the *Law of Moses*, which indeed Sinners in general had no concern with; nor do I see how it can be said, that our being justified by Faith establishes that Law; it seems much rather indeed to set it aside: This at least is certain, our Apostle shews upon all Occasions, that Faith in Christ exempted the *Gentiles* from all manner of Concern with that *Law*; or, if we turn it the other way, entirely precluded that Law from having any Thing to do with them. But taking *Law* here for that universal Law of the Creator, by Transgression whereof all the World was become guilty before God; then it is plain, God's having set forth Jesus Christ to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, is so far from lessening Men's Re-
spect

spect to that Law, that it gives it, as I may say, the highest Reputation; in that God hath shewed such Regard to it, that he would not pardon the Transgressors of it without such a Propitiation. And this may let us see what the Apostle intends by *Justice*, when he says, God set forth Christ as a Propitiation in his Blood for the Demonstration of his Justice; his Justice in animadverting upon the Transgression of the Law, not suffering Sin to go unpunish'd; though he justifies the Sinner freely by his Grace. We may have occasion to say more of this Matter hereafter, when we shall take Notice of some Objections against this Doctrine. I have insisted the more upon this, because some, I find, are willing to lay a mighty Stress upon it, that the Scripture no where represents the Death of Christ as a Display of Divine Justice, or an Argument of the Divine Purity. If our Explication of this Discourse of the Apostle, and what we have remark'd upon some other Passages of Scripture be right, this Objection appears to be founded in a Mistake^t. And why this was not more frequently and distinctly insisted on, hath been, I think, sufficiently accounted for.

We

^t It hath been suggested, "That there is another Interpretation of *δικαιοσύνη* and *δικαιόω* in this Passage of St. Paul, which the Contexture in which those Words stand, not only will admit, but seems to require, *viz* Faithfulness in keeping his Promises." And for this I am referr'd to Mr. Locke. This Interpretation, I must own, hath a much better Appearance than that which I endeavour'd to confute. I had no Remembrance of Mr. Locke's having given this Sense of the Words; nor did I consult him or any other Commentator; for the same Reason as I declin'd reading any writer upon the Subject, being willing to form my Notion upon a naked View of the Scriptures themselves. I have since upon this Suggestion consider'd impartially Mr. Locke's *Paraphrase* and *Notes* upon this Chapter.

We brought in the last Verse of the Chapter, [*Do we then make void the Law through Faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the Law*] as a Confirmation of the Sense we had given of *δικαιοσύνη* in the Passages explained above: That the Reader may not think this too far fetch'd, because of two other Questions intervening, I shall add a brief Account the latter part of that Chapter, according to my Sense of it. I take those three Questions to refer to the several parts of the preceding Discourse, and they may be consider'd, partly as Inferences from the several Particulars referr'd to, and partly as a farther Confirmation of what he had asserted. He had shewed that the *Jews* were equally with the *Gentiles*

Chapter; I pay a great Deference to Mr. *Locke's* Judgment; for I believe no Man hath shewn greater Sagacity and Penetration in entering into the Views of an Author, than Mr. *Locke* hath done in his *Paraphrase and Notes upon St. Paul's Epistles*; yet I must beg leave to say, that I do not see sufficient Reason for putting that unusual Sense upon the Words *δικαιοσύνη* and *δικαιοσύνη*. I call it *unusual*, for I don't remember that any where in the New Testament these Terms are used to denote *Faithfulness in keeping a Promise*; I mean faithfulness in particular, though that may indeed be comprehended under the general Notion of Justice.

It hath been said, "This is manifestly the Meaning of the Word *δικαιοσύνη*, 1 *John* i. 9." It is indeed there join'd with *πίστις*; but I think it is plainly an additional Consideration, not barely a synonymous Term. The Apostle had said, that *the Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God cleanseth us from all Sin*: Now the Blood of Christ is represented as the *Price* of our Redemption, and so gives a Claim or Title distinct from, and over and above that of a mere Promise; Christ having by the Will of God (and we may say, according to Agreement or Compact) given himself a Ransom; it is in the most strict

Gentiles become guilty before God, and that by *Deeds of the Law* no *Flesh* could be justified in his sight, and therefore that God had now manifested a *Righteousness* without Law, even by the Faith of Christ. To this, as I apprehend, refers the first Question, *Where then is boasting?* To which the Jews were so much inclin'd; (see *Cbap. ii.*) It is excluded. By what Law? Of Works; such as was that the Jews rested in, and made their boast of, (*Cbap. ii. 17, 23*). Nay; but by the Law of Faith; by this new Dispensation, which makes Faith alone the Term of our obtaining Righteousness or Justification. This also shews the Wisdom of this Dispensation, wherein God hath taken care, that no *Flesh* should glory in his Presence, but that he that glorieth should glory in the

strict Sense an *Act of Justice* to forgive penitent Sinners believing in Jesus. And so I suppose the Term παρακλησις in the following Chapter, where the Apostle says, *We have an Advocate with the Father*, intends more than barely an Intercessor; namely, one that pleads for us, he having been the Propitiation for our Sins. Now I think there can be but these two Reasons for affixing that unusual Sense to the Words in the Passage now under Consideration; either that the Contexts leads to it, or that the more common, natural Sense of the Words which I have taken, doth not so well suit with the Subject and the Apostle's Discourse in this Place. Mr. Locke supposes, that by δικαιοσυνη in the 5th Verse must be meant, "The Faithfulness of God in keeping his Promise of saving Believers, Gentiles as well as Jews, by Righteousness through Faith in Jesus Christ." (*Vide Note upon Verse 5.*) This he thinks is plain from the preceding Verse, where it is said *Let God be true*. But what if neither αληθης in the 4th Verse; nor even την πισιν τε Θεου in the 3d Verse, should intend the Faithfulness of God in keeping his Promise? I think there is reason to doubt. Mr. Locke's Paraphrase on the Words, *Shall their Unbelief make the Faith*

the Lord, 1 Cor. i. 29, 31. *We conclude therefore that a Man is justified by Faith, without Deeds of Law.*

Faith of God of no effect? is thus; "Yet their Unbelief cannot render the Truth and Faithfulness of God of no effect, who had promised to be a God to Abraham and to his Seed, and to bless them in all Generations." But I don't find that the Apostle had taken any notice of this *Promise to Abraham* in all his preceding Discourse: When he brings in the Question in the beginning of this Chapter, *What Advantage then hath the Jew, and what Profit is there of Circumcision?* The principal Thing he insists on in answer to it, is not, that God had promised to be a God unto Abraham, &c. but that *to them had been committed the Oracles of God.* And therefore the following Words, *For what if some did not believe?* seem directly to refer to that Article of the Advantage he had given them, and are to be consider'd as an Objection to it. "You say this was their great Advantage; but we see, that though they had the *Oracles of God*, which declared to them the Way of Righteousness, as it is written, *The Just shall live by Faith*; yet many of them did not believe, and so did not attain to Righteousness." To this the Apostle replies, "Shall their failing of Righteousness through their Unbelief, make that Faith of God, the Faith which he had appointed and declared to be the Means of our obtaining Righteousness, a vain empty Thing; or make that Declaration of God, *The Just shall live by Faith*, to signify nothing? No; let God be acknowledged to be true in all his Declarations——As it is written, *That thou mightest be justified in thy Sayings*"——*Ἐν λόγοις* is a very general Expression, relating to any Declarations that God had made; and in the Place whence those Words are taken is far from having any direct Reference to a Promise: See *Psal. li. 4.* The Apostle doth indeed take Notice of the Promise to Abraham and his Seed in some of the following Chapters; there he is explicit enough, both with respect to the Promise, and in an-

F

suring

Law. Again he had said, that this Righteousness of God by the Faith of Christ, is unto all and upon all

swering the Objections that might arise upon that Head. By the way we may observe, that the manner of Expression is different when he brings in an Objection of this kind. *Hath the Word of God failed? Or Not as though the Word of God had failed*, Chap. ix. 6. which seems much more proper when he is considering whether a Promise hath been made good or not, than the *future* here used *μη καταργησιν* shall their Unbelief make the Faithfulness of God of none effect? I take the Apostle here to use the Term *πιστις* *Θεου* in the same manner as he uses *δικαιοσυνη* *Θεου* in his Entrance upon this Discourse, Chap. i. 17. and frequently in this Epistle, the one is as proper as the other; after the same manner Mr. Locke interprets *της δοξης του Θεου* in the 23d Verse of this Chapter. And the Words, *Let God be true*, &c. in the 4th Verse, I refer to that Declaration of God which the Apostle had mention'd in entering upon this Subject, *As it is written, the Just shall live by Faith*; the Truth of which Declaration was not at all affected, or in the least impaired by the Unbelief of some among them to whom the Oracles of God had been committed, *q. d.* "This is still a true and faithful Saying; "and it was really an Advantage that they had the "Oracles of God, which declared to them this Way "of Righteousness, though some of them through "their Unbelief miss'd of the Righteousness they were "directed to." Upon the whole, I see no necessity of understanding *πιστις* in the 3d Verse, or *αληθης* in the 4th Verse, to intend *Faithfulness to a Promise*; since the Apostle had never once mentioned the Promise Mr. Locke refers to, in all his preceding Discourse; and treats of this expressly afterwards.

But allowing Mr. Locke's Interpretation of the 3d and 4th Verses, I don't apprehend that this will at all oblige us to put the same Sense [*Faithfulness*] upon *δικαιοσυνη* in the 5th Verse. Here I can't but observe, that (Mr. Locke when he interprets *δικαιοσυνη* of God's Faith-

all them that believe; and that there is no Difference.
To this refers the following Question, *Is he the God of*
the

Faithfulness in keeping his Promise, makes it refer to another kind of Promise, viz. "The Promise of saving Believers, Gentiles as well as Jews, by Righteousness through Faith in Jesus Christ." This is very different from the Promise he refers to in the 3d Verse; and indeed the Promise here suppos'd would by no means suit the 3d Verse. God had already accomplished this Promise of *saving Believers through Faith in Jesus Christ*. And according to Mr. Locke's Interpretation of Ver. 25, 26. "God's having set forth Jesus Christ as the Mercy-seat through Faith in his Blood, was a strong Demonstration of his Faithfulness in keeping this Promise, notwithstanding the Provocation of the Jews;" how then should it be made a Question, *μη καταργηται* shall their Unbelief make the Faithfulness of God of no effect? Could it be made a Question, whether their Unbelief should make a Promise void which had already been accomplished? Make that Faithfulness to fail which had already been actually demonstrated by a glorious Fulfilment of the Promise? So that this would by no means suit with the 3d Verse. But if *δικαιοσυνη* in the 5th Verse be the same as *πιστις* *Θεου* in the 3d Verse, is it not strange that they should respect Promises of so very different Nature, that what is supposed to be referr'd to in the latter could not be referr'd to in the former. This shews that there was no Promise mention'd or specified; and hence Mr. Locke takes the liberty of applying the one and the other of the fore-mentioned Passages to such Promise as he thought proper; i. e. the *πιστις* *Θεου* in the 3d Verse to one sort of Promise, and the *δικαιοσυνη* *Θεου* in the 5th Verse to another sort of Promise. However, I must not conceal what Mr. Locke hath observ'd, as a Confirmation, I suppose, of his Sense of *δικαιοσυνη* in this Verse, viz. "That St. Paul's great Design here, and all through the eleven first Chapters of this Epistle, was to convince the Romans that God purpos'd, and in the Old Testament declared, that he would re-

the Jews only? Is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also. That this Question refers to that part

“ receive and save the *Gentiles* by Faith in the Messiah, “ which was the only way whereby *Jews* and *Gentiles* “ were to be saved.” Now it must be confessed, that the Apostle had said in the beginning of this Epistle, that the Gospel now preached *had been promised before by the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures*; but this he was not yet come to treat of: His Discourie hitherto proceeds upon a very different Topick, representing the State both of *Jews* and *Gentiles* as needing such a way of Justification, *they being all Sinners, and equally destitute of Righteousness by Works* (Mr. Locke *ibid.*) This is manifestly the drift of the former part of his Epistle; afterwards he shews, that this way of justifying Sinners, as well of the *Gentiles* as of the *Jews*, was what God had designed of old, and spoken of by the Prophets.

But now as to this 5th Verse I take it to proceed entirely upon a New Head, and to have no manner of Reference to, or Connexion with the preceding Objection. This was a general Objection against the Doctrine, and a Calumny upon Christians, “ as if “ they preaching Justification by Free Grace, said, “ Let us do Evil that Good may come of it,” as Mr. Locke could not but acknowledge (see his Notes [p] and [s]); and indeed the Words plainly shew it. *If our Unrighteousnesses, αδικια ημων*, that is in general the Unrighteousness of any of us who hope to be justified by believing, commend the Righteousness of God; this Righteousness of God by Faith which is revealed in the Gospel: Chap. i. 17. i. e. “ If our Sins tend to make “ the Free Grace of God, in this way of justifying Sinners, more illustrious, is it not hard or unrighteous in “ God to take Vengeance, or to bring his Wrath upon “ Sinners?” The Adversaries would load the Apostle’s Doctrine with these odious Consequences, That it gave Men hopes of Impunity; that it encouraged that pernicious Principle, Let us do Evil that Good may come

part of the Discourse appears plainly from the Words following, *Seeing it is one God who will justify*

come of it; and perhaps would insinuate an Inconsistency in his Doctrine, for he had said also, *Chap. i. 18. that the Wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all Unrighteousness of Men*, “How can it be suppos’d that God should shew any Resentment of the Wickedness of Men, would he not be unjust *επιφειων, ὁργην*, or how can you say that *ὁργη Θεου* is revealed from Heaven against all Unrighteousness of Men; when it’s plain, that the Unrighteousness of Men commends that Righteousness of God by Faith, which you publish to the World?” These were Absurdities they would pretend to fix upon his Doctrine; and thus we see that *δικαιοσυνη Θεου* may very well be taken here in the same Sense as in the beginning of the Epistle, *Chap. i. 17.* I think ought to be so taken; and consequently there is no manner of Occasion for the Turn that Mr. Locke gives it, “If it be so, that our Unrighteousness commendeth the Righteousness of God in keeping his Word given to our Forefathers——”

As to the 7th Verse, which as Mr. Locke justly observes, is plainly a Continuation of the Adversary’s Objection; I conceive it to be brought in only as a plausible Instance, by way of illustrating the Principle that some would fix upon Christians: *if the Truth of God abound through my Lie to his glory*; i. e. “If I by lying advance his Truth, and promote his Glory, why am I then condemned as a Sinner?” It is certainly a very hard Construction that Mr. Locke gives of *ψωματι* in this Verse, making it to signify Sin in general; I question whether there be any other Instance, even in St. Paul’s Epistles, how fond soever he may be suppos’d to be of Antitheses, that will come up to it, I think there is no occasion for it.

After all, this whole Matter, from the *first Verse* of this Chapter to the 9th Verse, is but an incidental Discourse to obviate some Objections or Calumnies that had been raised upon Christians and their Doctrine.

fy the Circumcifion through Faith, and the Uncircumcifion by Faith. And this being fo highly agreeable

to

And if it did never fo plainly appear to refer to God's *Faithfulnefs in keeping his Words*; I don't fee that this would be a fufficient Foundation for the affixing that Sense to δικαιο and δικαιοσυνη in the 25th and 26th Verses.

Those Words in the 23d Verfe being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, feem to me to give moft Pre- tence for Mr. Locke's Interpretation of the 25th and 26th Verses. It might be very proper for the Apoftle in his Entrance upon the particular Explication of his Do- ctrine to preface it with this Obfervation, that *it was witnessed by the Law and the Prophets*; which might take off the Prejudice of the Jew, and make way for its more eafy Reception. The Expreflion μαρτυρουμι leads our Thoughts to an *Authority* confirming his Do- ctrine, rather than to a *Promise* or *Prediction*. Such an incidental Obfervation, not confider'd as a Promise, but as we may juftly fuppofe, brought in with another View, merely as a Testimony of God's having long fince fixed upon this Way of juftifying Sinners; this I fay cannot be, in my Apprehenfion, a fufficient Rea- fon for putting that unusual Sense upon the Words δικαιο; and δικαιοσυνη.

And now whether the more natural Sense according to my Interpretation do not as well fuit with the Apoftle's Difcourfe upon the Subject, I muft leave to every one to judge from what hath been faid in the Treatife above. Mr. L. hath a Remark upon the Word παρις, which may be very juft: He obferves, "that it is not any where ufed for Remiffion or Forgiveness, but paffing by or overlooking;" this agrees perfectly well with my Explication of δια την παρις των προηγυνοτων αμαρ- τηματων εν τη ανοχη του θεου; and I think doth include the Behaviour of God (if I may fo exprefs it) with refpect to the Sins of the Gentile World, as well as of the Jews. There is undoubtedly fomewhat very particular intend- ed

10 Reason, may be consider'd as a farther Confirmation of this Method of Grace, God having hereby
fully

ed in the Word προγεγονοται. Now in the past Ages God may well be said to have overlooked as it were the Sins of the *Gentile World*, having sent no Notices of his Displeasure to them; God winked at them: As to the *Jews*, God had expressly made known himself to them as a God forgiving Iniquity, Transgression and Sin; but their Sacrifices could not be look'd upon as a sufficient Testimony of God's Displeasure against Sin; and 'tis remarkable that the most heinous Sins, when they were forgiven, were forgiven without any Sacrifice at all: As in the Case of *David*, Psal li. 16. So that neither under that Dispensation had there been a sufficient Demonstration of the Justice of God; i. e. to use the Apostle's Expression, he had not sufficiently appeared to be just, while he justified such Sinners. Because of this seeming overlooking of Sin in Times past both in the *Gentile World* and also among the *Jews*; God had now set forth *Jesus Christ as the Propitiation*; (or as Mr. L. chuses to render it, as the Mercy-seat) ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ for a Demonstration of his Justice; that now at length he might let all Men see, that notwithstanding the Forbearance exercised in times past, he hath a just Resentment of Sin, and a proper Regard to the righteous Sanction of his Law. To this agrees what the *Writer to the Hebrews* observes with respect to the Sins under the first Covenant, *Christ was made the Mediator of a New Covenant*, θανάτῳ γενομένου ἐκ ἀπολύσεως τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ ἁμαρτιῶν. Cap. ix. 15.

I might add, the whole Sentence in my Apprehension runs much smoother, taking the Words δια τῆς παρ:σιν in the Sense I have given of them, than in Mr. *Lock's* Paraphrase; where the attributing the manifestation of the Righteousness of God to the setting forth *Christ, &c.* and at the same Time to the passing by their former Transgressions, seems somewhat confus'd; it not being easy to perceive which is the principal Thing intended as the manifestation of God's Righteousness. Methinks there is an odd Sort of a Jumble in the Sen-

fully manifested, that he is indeed the God of the Gentiles, and not of the Jews only. Again, the Apostle

tence (if I may be allow'd so to express it) "God set forth Christ for the manifesting his Righteousness by passing over their former Transgressions." I leave it to the Reader to put it my Way, and to make the Comparison. He may consider also, which Interpretation yields the more forcible and grateful Antithesis in the concluding Words; *ὡς το ἵνα ἀνὸν δικαίον καὶ δικαιῶσι*—

There is one Thing more I would take Notice of, which seems to me of greater Weight; and with that I shall put an End to this tedious Debate about a single Text. If we take Mr. Lock's Interpretation of this Passage. I see no Foundation in the preceding Discourse for that bold Appeal of the Apostle in the *last Verse*. *Do we then make void Law through Faith? Yea, we establish Law.* Mr. Lock in his Note upon this Verse observes, "that the Doctrine of Justification by Faith necessarily supposes a Rule of Righteousness, which those who are justified by Faith come short of; and also a Punishment incurr'd, from which they are set free by being justified." Very true. But what is this other than the very Thing objected? *viz.* "that whereas they were before under a Law which render'd them obnoxious to Punishment for the Breach of it; their being now justified by Faith only *χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου* this made void Law." Mr. Lock adds indeed, "that the moral Part of the Law of Moses is enforc'd again by our Saviour." This also is true; but not a word of this had been mention'd. What is there in all the preceding Discourse that may support this Assertion of the Apostle: *Yea we establish Law*, i. e. as I think any one must understand him, "by the Doctrine we have deliver'd we establish Law." Doth the justifying the Believer freely by the Grace of God, establish Law? this is the very Thing that gives Rise to the Objection. Doth the Demonstration of
God's

Apostle had declared, that we are *justified freely by the Grace of God, through the Redemption that is in Christ; God having set forth him to be a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood, for the Demonstration of*

F 5

his

God's Righteousness in keeping his Word notwithstanding the Provocation of the Jews establish Law? But if we understand the *demonstrating his Justice* in the Sense I have given, here we see a sufficient Ground for his answering in the Manner he doth; as I have shewed in the Treatise.

It hath been thought strange that we should not have this so explicitly declar'd in any other Place of Scripture: "So often as the sacred Writers have occasion to mention the Death of Christ, as ascertaining to us the Pardon of our Sins, &c. So often as they do mention it with Transports of Gratitude, as a glorious Instance and Proof of the Love and Goodness, the Faithfulness and Wisdom of God; that they should never but once so much as seem to mention it as a Proof of God's Hatred of Sin, and of his Justice in punishing it, this may incline one to believe that they never do so much as once mention it in that Way." Besides what hath been said in the Treatise it may be consider'd, that we have not in any other Place of the New Testament such a *jet Discourse* upon the Subject: Here the Apostle doth professedly treat of the Matter, gives as it were the entire Scheme of this Dispensation; consequently here we have a more full and distinct View of the Design of God therein. But if after all, my Interpretation of this Passage be not admitted; still I say, tho' the Word *Justice* be not used with Reference to this Point; yet in general, wherever the Death of Christ is spoken of as a Sacrifice for Sin or an Atonement, there I think it is plainly represented as a Token of God's Displeasure against Sin; and particularly when it's said, *the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him, God laid upon him the Iniquity of us all*; and in Consequence thereof that *it pleased the Lord to bruise him, &c.*

his Justice, &c. To this refers the last Question, *Do we then make void Law through Faith?* Far from it by this Regard which God hath shewn to his Law, by this Demonstration of Justice, we establish the Authority of, and the Regard that is due to a Divine Law: Which may be a farther Satisfaction and Evidence, that this is a Dispensation of Mercy becoming a Righteous and a Holy God, and the Effect of Divine Wisdom. The Reader will excuse this Digression, because it not only strengthens my Explication of the Passage I had occasion to take notice of; but, as I apprehend, gives Light to the whole Discourse of the Apostle in that third Chapter of his Epistle to the *Romans*.

We had observ'd that in the Account the Scripture gives of the Concern Christ had in our Redemption, there is, in perfect Correspondence with the Levitical Institution, a Dispensation of Mercy, in such a Way as might at the same Time demonstrate the Justice and Holiness of God. The latter Part we have first consider'd, that having been principally call'd in Question: The former needs not to be much insisted on, it being so frequently, so particularly and expressly declared, and indeed carrying its own Evidence with it. If any have taken Occasion, from the Redemption that is in Christ, to represent the blessed God as being in himself implacable, and that his Inclination or Disposition to shew Mercy was owing merely to Christ's interposing on our Behalf; I am sure the Scripture gives no Colour for this. The love of God and his Compassion to Sinners, is there represented as the very Spring of this Constitution; and the whole Scheme of our Redemption attributed to the Contrivance of the Father: So our Lord himself, *God so loved the World, that he sent his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should*

not

not perish but have everlasting Life. And so his Apostles afterwards in all their Writings.

But if God was of himself originally dispos'd to shew Mercy, how then is the Death of Christ a *Propitiation*? Just in the same Manner as we accounted for a Propitiation under the *Mosaical* Constitution. There God first orders a Mercy-Seat, then he requires that Application be made to him as residing there, by Sacrifice and by Mediation of an High-Priest: Without such Application, or Addressing in this way, they were liable to Justice for their Offences, and were to be excluded from any Approach unto God upon account of their Uncleanness. So here; God resolves to shew Mercy to Sinners, but at the same Time he determines that his only begotten Son (to be sure not without his own Consent) shall suffer Death, the Penalty which the original Law had denounced against Transgressors; hereby to demonstrate his Regard to the righteous Sanction of the Law, and his Displeasure against Sin: The Sinner shall be restor'd to the Blessings he had forfeited, he is admitted to the Presence and Favour of God, as if he had never offended; here we see entire Forgiveness, perfect Reconciliation; and this of pure Grace, since Men had done nothing to deserve it. 'Tis a *Righteousness of God without Law, unto all and upon all them that believe*: But 'tis through the Redemption of Christ. The Case in short is this, and I think very easy to be conceiv'd: God is determin'd not to pass by the Sins of Men without Christ's dying for them (we are not now considering for what Reasons this was so determin'd) now if Christ do actually die for this Purpose, and so make way for the Exercise of Mercy, it may certainly with the utmost Propriety and Strictness be said, he is a *Propitiation for our Sins*; inasmuch

as by his suffering Death he hath prevented or kept off those Effects and Consequences of Sin which would otherwise have come upon us. We see here Mercy, pure Mercy to Sinners: But God appoints that the Mercy and Favour he designs for Sinners shall be convey'd to them or confer'd upon them in this Way, *viz.* that Christ shall dye as a Sacrifice, and act as a Priest for them. This being insisted on, and Christ having comply'd with it, his Death and his Mediation are very justly represented as the Means of procuring for us the Blessings we partake of. Thus he is said to have *obtained eternal Redemption*, (Heb. ix. 12.) and to be the *Author*, or Cause, (*causæ*) of *eternal Redemption to all them that obey him*. Yea, and this being requir'd that Christ should shed his Blood, hence it is sometimes represented as a *Price* paid for us (which is indeed the primary Notion convey'd to us by the Word Redemption,) Christ himself says, he came to give his Life a *Ransom* for many. He is said to have *purchased the Church* with his own Blood. Ye are *bought with a Price*, says the Apostle, (1 Cor. vi. 20. Chap. vii. 23.) The redeemed use the same Expression in their Song of Praise to the Lamb, Rev. v. 9. *Thou hast bought us to God with thy own Blood* ^u.

It

“ Christ's Death was *truly* and *properly*, in the
 “ strictest Meaning of the Word, an expiatory Sacri-
 “ fice. For if Sinners by having diminished the Ho-
 “ nour, and despised the Authority of God's Laws,
 “ were by come liable to the Justice and Vengeance of
 “ God; if the Son of God in our Nature by vindic-
 “ ating the Honour of God's Laws, hath discharged
 “ this Obligation, and obtain'd Remission for us; and
 “ if the obtaining this Remission was by the Shedding
 “ of his Blood, which is call'd the *Price of our Re-*
 “ *demption*, 1 Cor. vi. 20. It follows, that the Wrath
 “ of God was appeased by the Death of Christ, and
 “ that

It is this Representation of the Matter which I suppose gave Rise to the Term SATISFACTION, which hath been generally us'd in treating of this Subject. It must be own'd the *making Satisfaction* is not a Phrase the Scripture makes use of upon this Occasion; and if taken in the most strict and rigorous Sense, as if this was what the original Law requir'd, and which God in Justice could not refuse, as when one Man pays another's Debt, this would indeed utterly exclude Mercy and Grace. But the Case is very different: By the original Constitution the Sinner became liable to Death; suppose that another Person tho' never so excellent freely offered himself to suffer in his stead; was there any Obligation by Virtue of that Law to accept of this in lieu of the Offender's Suffering? In Case of a Debt the Creditor hath claim only to the Payment of the Debt; consequently if any Person discharges the Debt, the Claim ceases. But the Transgressor of the Law becomes liable in his own Person, and the Law hath undeniably a just Demand of his Suffering. But now God, the supreme Lord and Lawgiver, sets aside this original Constitution; he freely remits to the Sinner the Punishment he had deserv'd; here is pure Mercy to the Sinner: But he requires that Christ shall suffer; he doth not see fit to shew Mercy without such Testimony of his just Displeasure against Sin, which doth not in the least interfere with the Mercy and Grace shewed to the Sinner; no, he is as entirely beholden to Mercy, as if Christ had not been at all concern'd. Nay, it being suppos'd that God

saw
 " that God was graciously pleased to accept this vicarious Suffering of his Son in the *Stead* of the Punishment that was due to the Sinner in his own Person; which is the express and most proper Notion of an expiatory Sacrifice." Dr. Clark's *Sermon upon the Sufferings of Christ*, Vol. 8. p. 366,

saw fit to require this Intervention of Christ, at the same Time that he pardon'd the Offender; God's sending his Son to what was requir'd, is an unspeakable Inhancement of the Love and Grace manifested to Sinners; which we may have farther Occasion to take Notice of hereafter. And now this being requir'd in the new Constitution, the very Foundation of which is laid in a Resolution of shewing Mercy to Sinners; it being requir'd, I say, that Christ should die for our Sins, his Death may, as far as I can perceive, be fitly enough call'd *Satisfaction*; not as if it were a satisfying the original Law; nor strictly speaking a satisfying Justice, as if this were the Answering all that Justice might demand; but it did answer what God in this new Settlement did think fit to demand: The Scripture calls it a *Price*, Christ paid the Price, and so satisfied the Demand of God: God accepted it, God was satisfied. We read in the Book of *Exod.* Chap. xxx. ver. 11. &c. *The Lord spake to Moses, saying, when thou takest the Sum of the Children of Israel after their Number; then shall they give every Man a Ransom for his Soul to the Lord; that there be no Plague among them when thou numbrest them.* This Ransom was to be half a Shekel, the same for the rich as for the poor, and this, it's said, was to make *Atonement for their Souls*, and 'tis called the *Atonement-Money*. Here 'tis suppos'd that they were liable to be destroyed by a Plague from God, when they were number'd; God requires of every Man this Money as a Ransom; was this Money a Ransom which God was previously obliged to accept, so that upon their presenting such an Offering he could not in Justice have brought a Plague upon them, which otherwise they were suppos'd to have been liable to? None I presume will assert this. But now, when God requires this, and declares that this shall be a Ransom, and he accepts it as such; might

might it not be said, upon their Payment of the Money they had made Satisfaction; *i. e.* they had answer'd the Demands of God. I suppose the Apostle *Peter* may have Reference to this very Institution, when he says, forasmuch as ye know that ye were redeem'd, (or ransomed *λυτρωθητε*) not with corruptible Things, *as Silver and Gold*, but with the precious Blood of Christ. This Text suggests to me an Observation which it may not be amiss to add here to prevent Mistakes. Tho' I have plac'd the Satisfaction purely in the answering the Demand of God, or in his requiring and accepting; yet it will by no means follow, that God might indifferently appoint and accept of any Thing as a Ransom for the Souls of Men; I mean to reedeem them from eternal Death. There may be very good Reasons why some Things should not be accepted for that Purpose. And thus the Author to the *Hebrews* might very justly say, *It was not possible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sins*; when yet the *Offering of the Body of Christ once for all*, was judged proper and sufficient for that Purpose; and by that he hath for ever perfected them who are sanctified: It was not fit that we should be ransomed with *corruptible Things, as Silver and Gold*; but it was fit that the *precious Blood of Christ* should be accepted as a Ransom for us.

Upon the whole, I don't see any Thing in the Representation which is given of Christ's Death, as a Ransom, as a Price paid for us, &c. that doth in the least interfere with the Mercy and Grace of God to the Sinner; to which the Scripture every where ascribes the Salvation of Men. In short, our Redemption by Christ is represented as a Way contrived by God for the shewing Mercy to Sinners, and at the same Time manifesting his Displeasure against Sin.

C H A P. III.

Objections against the Doctrine propos'd in the foregoing Chapter consider'd: Particularly what hath been offer'd by Mr. Chubb in his late Pamphlet, entitled, [a Discourse concerning Reason, with Regard to Religion and divine Revelation.]

TH E Scripture, as we have seen, declares that Christ offer'd himself a Sacrifice, that he was called of God to be an High-priest, that he makes Intercession for us, &c. These and the like Declarations are so express, so frequent and sometimes so largely and so particularly insisted on, that it might be presum'd every one would immediately, without any the least Hesitation, understand them in their proper *literal* Sense. We have farther consider'd, what is the View the Scriptures give us of this Dispensation of God towards us: In which I see nothing absurd, nothing unbecoming the supreme Governour of the World.

But some there are, who can by no means relish these Doctrines. Some have thought them so absurd as to make them an Objection against the Christian Revelation; for it hath appear'd plain to them, that these are Doctrines of the New Testament. Others have such a Dislike of them, that while they receive the Writings of the New Testament, and acknowledge their Authority, they put a Force upon the plainest Expressions of Scripture, taking them in a figurative allusive Sense, or as us'd only by way of Accommodation to the receiv'd Notions of those with whom the Writers had to do at that Time; and can by no means admit that our Saviour is a *proper* Priest, that his Death

Death was a *real* Sacrifice, and his Blood *in a literal Sense* a Propitiation for the Sins of the World. As to the former Sort of Persons, they had need have clear Demonstration of some Absurdity in these Doctrines, before they take up with this as a sufficient Objection against the strong Evidence there is for the Christian Revelation: And truly I think nothing less can justify the latter in rejecting the plain obvious Sense of such express Declarations, so frequently repeated, so particularly insisted on, so fully argued, as these Matters are, and which indeed do run, as in one continued Stream, through the Writings of several of the Apostles. If these Doctrines can be made appear to be absurd, it must be own'd they are an unanswerable Objection against the Revelation, allowing them to be the Doctrines of Scripture; which the former Sort of Adversaries take for granted: On the other hand, supposing the divine Authority of the Scriptures, which is admitted by the latter, they also might then have Reason to say, as *Socinus* (I think it was he, tho' I don't remember whether with Relation to this or some other Subject) *Quævis Vis potius inferenda iis sacræ Scripturæ locis, quàm iste Sensus admittendus.*

Whether they can fasten any such Absurdity upon these Doctrines we shall consider by and by, when we shall examine some of the principal Objections that have been made to them. But if their Opposition to these Doctrines be founded only in a Dislike of the Method God had taken, because it doth not appear to them to be fit and wise; and therefore they perswade themselves, that God would never act so: I must tell them plainly, they take too much upon them. Where we plainly see upon a thorough understanding of a Matter, any Thing inconsistent with the moral Perfections

of

of God, we may venture to say, *God cannot do this*: Or where Expressions are us'd that in their literal Sense contradict any of the natural Perfections of Deity; there Reason obliges us to admit of a figurative Sense. But these are for the most Part only occasional Expressions; very different from direct positive Assertions, and the inculcating a Doctrine. Thus when God is spoken of as having bodily Parts and Members, or is represented as one of like Passions with us; every one readily owns the Figure, and can be in no Danger of a Mistake. To any one that considers, 'twill be the same Case where he finds any Thing attributed to God plainly inconsistent with *moral Perfection*; as when God is said to have *bardened the Heart against his Fear*, to have *deceived* the People, or the like; the same Scripture which so fully declares his absolute Holiness and hatred of Sin; which tells us that *God is not tempted of evil, nor can tempt any Man*, and describes him by the Character of a *God that cannot lie*; this same Scripture itself forbids us to take such Expressions as those above mention'd in a strict literal Sense. But where inspir'd Persons undertake to give us an Account of the Methods God hath taken, and tell us what he expects and requires of us in Consequence thereof, and this in Matters of the highest Concernment, in the Affair of our Salvation; surely, 'tis not enough to say, "we don't see the Reason of this, we think God might as well, or if it were better that he should, have done otherwise; and therefore we cannot believe this Account to be true." Are we such complete Judges of what is fit for God to do? are we so thoroughly appris'd of all Circumstances of the Relations of Things throughout his vast Dominion? have we the Views that God hath; that we must take upon us to pronounce, in direct Contradiction to the plain Account he himself

hath

hath given, "this is not fit for God to do; this
 "is a foolish Contrivance, and cannot come from
 "God?" What should we think of an ignorant
 Plowman that should pretend to confute a positive
 Narration of some Transactions of State, or of
 some Proceedings at Court, in the most authentick
 Manner attested, only by saying, "he can't con-
 "ceive the Government should ever take such
 "Methods, or that the Court should act after
 "this Manner, he shou'd think it were much
 "better to have done so or so?" Truly the
 Rashness or Presumption in that Case would come
 vastly short, in my Apprehension, of the Pre-
 sumption of those Men, who will reject an Ac-
 count God is pleas'd to give us of the Methods he
 thinks fit to take in managing the Concerns of
 his Government, merely because they don't see
 the Fitness or the Wisdom of them; or they ima-
 gine, that it might have been better to have order'd
 things otherwise. These are Matters for the most
 Part quite beyond our Sphere, entirely above our
 Reach. In some Cases we may discern the Wis-
 dom of his Ways, we perceive the Reasons, some
 Reasons at least of his Proceedings: But there
 may be many Cases wherein it is impossible we
 should, without a more distinct Knowledge of
 all Circumstances; and it must often happen, that
 his *Ways will be to us unsearchable, and his Judg-*
ments past our finding out. There are many Things
 which we see and know to be Facts, concerning
 which, if we could have propos'd them only by
 way of Speculation, or have brought them as an
 Account of Things in some distant Part of the
 World, I doubt not but the Persons who go upon
 the Principle we are now arguing against, would
 be as forward to conclude, "no; God would
 "never act thus, he would never suffer Things
 "to be so." What I mean is this; there are
 Things

Things in this visible World, in the Works of Creation and Providence, which to our View must appear as unfit, or which we see as little Reason for, as some Things which are objected against upon this Account in Revelation: With respect to the former Men cannot deny them, because they see them to be Facts; if so, surely that can be no sufficient Ground for denying the other; I mean their not seeing the Reasonableness or Fitness of them. There was some Time ago an ingenious Paper publish'd, shewing the Reasonableness of Christ's manifesting himself after his Resurrection to *chosen Witnesses* only, and not to the whole Nation of the *Jews*, as some Infidels say he ought to have done. I believe any one will judge, that not one in a Thousand of common Christians could have given so good Account of the Matter as that Writer did, or say so much to shew the Fitness of the Way our Saviour took to give the World proper Evidence of his Resurrection. But would it have been a reasonable Thing for any Christian to have rejected the History upon this Account, because he knew not how to make it out that this was the most proper Way; or because it might appear to him, as far as he could judge of the Matter, a much more likely Way to have convinc'd Mankind of the Truth of the Fact, if he had shewed himself publicly: I made this Reflection I remember, at the Time when I read that Paper. How often doth it happen, that Things which we have thought strange, others have been able easily to account for? or what we have been ready to censure at first hearing, afterwards, upon a more thorough Consideration, and a clearer View of all Circumstances, hath appeared highly fit and reasonable? And if it be a common piece of Deference and Respect we owe to a Person of approved Wisdom, to judge that

he may in many Cases have Reasons for his Proceedings which we know nothing of ; don't we owe as much to the supreme Governour of the World ? Unless therefore we will say that God is obliged in every Instance to let us see the Reasons of his Proceeding, we can have no Pretence to make our *not seeing the Reason* a Ground for denying the Thing, when we have sufficient Testimony ; or for putting a forc'd Construction upon a plain Narrative, when we do receive it as an Account which God himself is pleas'd to give us. For surely it may very well be suppos'd that the Ways of God in his Government will be as much above us and beyond our Penetration, as the Ways of Men.

I don't say all this out of any Need we have to betake ourselves to this Refuge with respect to the Subject before us ; far from it. The Wisdom of God, in my Apprehension, shines out brightly in this Dispensation ; which we shall endeavour to make manifest in some Measure hereafter. But I would shew how little Force there is in the Objection, were it really so, that we could not see the fitness of this Method. And what we have said may be of more general Use, to give some Check to that daring Boldness which some seem dispos'd to run into, who pretend to have a great Regard to Reason and to Natural Religion. To speak freely, it appears to me an unreasonable Presumption, and will, I fear, be charged by the great Judge of all as Pride and Arrogance, for a Man to resolve that he will pay no regard to any Thing as coming from God, unless God will please to satisfy him of the Reason of his Counsels and Actions ; and that the want of this shall be made a sufficient Ground for rejecting the clearest Evidence of a Divine Revelation.

But

But it is not only the Want of Wisdom which some Men have to object; they think they see many Absurdities in the Scheme of Redemption, as we understand it to be represented in Scripture. It is no new Thing to hear of Christ crucified, being accounted as *Foolishness*. But we might reckon a small Matter. This way of our Redemption, as we apprehend it to be set forth in Scripture, hath been charged as being unjust in itself; yea, and as subverting all Law and Divine Government. Mr. *Chubb* hath been as bold in his Charge as any I have met with of late; we will therefore particularly consider what he hath offer'd upon this Subject, in his *Discourse concerning Reason with regard to Religion and Divine Revelation*.

But before I come to his severe Charges against the Doctrine of a Satisfaction, I would take notice of an Objection, of a milder Nature indeed, but which is brought against any Mediation on the behalf of Men. It hath been said, "What need of
 " a Mediator? Yea that it seems no ways be-
 " coming a holy, wise, and merciful God, to
 " shew Favour to any at, or through the Inter-
 " cession of another: If the Person be a proper
 " Object of the Divine Favour, 'tis a lessening
 " and disparaging the *Mercy* of God to bring in
 " the Intercession of another in order to such
 " a Person's receiving Favour from God; if the
 " Person be in himself unworthy, unfit to be an
 " Object of Divine Favour, 'tis a Disparagement
 " to the Divine *Wisdom and Holiness* to suppose that
 " God is prevail'd on by any Intercession of ano-
 " ther to shew Favour to such a one." It is true
 where a Person is overcome by mere Importunity
 to shew Favour in a Case where no Favour
 ought

ought to be shewn, this is Weakness. As on the other hand, if there be no Disposition or Inclination to shew Kindness and Compassion when the Case doth really deserve Pity, but every Instance of Kindness is, as we say, merely extorted by the Entreaty of some other on their behalf, this shews a Defect of Mercy and Goodness. I need not say, that there is no Foundation for the least Reflection either way upon the blessed God, according to the Account we have given from Scripture of the Mediation of Christ. It hath appeared, that God was of his own free Motion disposed to shew Mercy to proper Objects, *i. e.* to penitent Sinners; nor is he by any Entreaty or Interposition whatsoever drawn to shew Favour to any but such. But if it is an Act of *Mercy* to restore a Sinner to Favour, is not God at liberty to dispense this Mercy in such way as he pleases? What if, for wise Ends, though unknown to us, he sees fit to require, that the Offender come by a Mediator whom he shall appoint, to receive a Pardon; is the Benefit the less, or is the Goodness the less, because the Sinner is requir'd to receive his Pardon in this way? Will any Man pretend to demonstrate, that in no Case it can be fit to shew Mercy through a Mediator, but where it would be equally fit, or rather more fit to shew Mercy without a Mediator? Men both wise and merciful have sometimes thought it most proper to take this Method; they have chose to shew Kindness, especially to an Offender, by means of the Interposition of some other Person, when that very Interposition hath been from their own Motion, and of their own procuring: But it is enough, if God see fit so to order it. I am sure it shall never be charg'd upon him, that he shewed Favour to an unfit Object to gratify the unreasonable Importunity of another; or that any proper Object

Object mis'd his Favour only for want of some to interpose on his behalf.

But if after all it should appear to me not so agreeable to Divine Wisdom to take this Method, the Point to be consider'd is, have I such clear Demonstration of the Unfitness, as is an over-balance to the Evidence we have, that God hath taken this Method? Till a Man can say this, I think it concerns him to be cautious; and the least he can do is to suspend, lest he be charg'd with taking upon him to censure the Divine Conduct, as if he were wiser than God. Might it not be said to such an Objector, *Who art thou, O Man! that repliest against God?*

And what if another should come and argue in like manner against all Prayer, against praying for our selves, as this Man doth against the Mediation or Intercession of another? May he not say, "The
 " omniscient and perfectly good Being can never
 " require, that we should make Supplication to
 " him for any Thing we want; he knows what
 " we want without our asking, and his Goodness
 " needs not to be stirr'd up by our Importunity;
 " 'tis a Disparagement to the Perfections of God,
 " to imagine that he should require this of his
 " Creatures, and suspend his Blessings upon their
 " making Application to him, as if he had the
 " Vanity to be pleas'd with the frequent Addresses
 " of Men; and therefore those Commands or Directions we meet with in Scripture, *To ask that
 " we may receive; to pray without ceasing, &c.*
 " cannot be a Revelation from God; or else we
 " must understand them in some figurative Sense,
 " as intending only to intimate to us, that God is
 " always as ready to give, as Men are when they
 " are earnestly solicited and entreated." If such
 Objections

Objections as these must be allow'd to outweigh any Evidence we can have of a Divine Revelation; or such Arguings must be thought sufficient to overthrow the plainest Sense of Words; I believe we must despair of ever having sufficient ground to receive a Revelation as coming from God; or if we should receive it, it must signify nothing.

It hath also been suggested, " That Christ's
 " making Intercession in Heaven doth not seem to
 " be consistent with the Account we have in Scrip-
 " ture of his Exaltation at the right Hand of God,
 " and having all Power actually put into his own
 " Hands." It might be enough to observe, in answer to this, that the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* saw no Inconsistency in this. He frequently takes notice of Christ's Advancement at the right Hand of God; yea, very particularly, when he considers him as our High Priest; and gives that as a Proof of his vastly superior Excellency in that Character or Office, *Chap. x. 11, &c.* Every Priest standeth daily ministring and offering oftentimes the same Sacrifices, which can never take away Sins; but this Man, after he had offered one Sacrifice for Sins, for ever sat down on the right Hand of God, from henceforth expecting till all his Enemies be made his Footstool. It is manifest that here he refers to the *cixth Psalm*, where we see God himself hath joined these together, his Exaltation as Lord of all, and his being at the same Time a Priest: *The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right Hand until I make thine Enemies thy Footstool.* Afterwards in the same *Psalm* it is said, *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a Priest for ever, after the Order of Melchisedec.* Nay, the Author of that Epistle reckons this among the Qualifications that became him who was to be our High Priest: *Such an High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless—*

and made higher than the Heavens, Chap. vii. 26. In short, he is a Priest upon his Throne And agreeable to this is the Representation given of him in the Book of Revelation, Chap. v. 6. I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the Throne a Lamb as it had been slain. His appearing in Heaven as a Lamb that had been slain, or his appearing in the Presence of God for us, may be consider'd as the continual Exercise of his Priestly Office; He is a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedec. He ever lives to make Intercession for us: His sitting down on the right Hand of God, actually invested with all Power in Heaven and Earth, being the Fruit and Consequence of his having offered himself a Sacrifice by the Will of God, is the highest Security possible of the Success of his Intercession. Thus St. Paul, in representing the strong Assurance we have of the Favour of God through Christ, mentions his Intercession as the Consummation of it, after he had taken notice of his sitting at the right Hand of God. Rom. viii. 34. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died; yea rather, that is risen again; who is even at the right Hand of God; who also maketh Intercession for us.

But let us consider what Mr. Chubb hath to object. It was indeed the reading his late Discourse that gave occasion to this Review I have taken of the Scripture Account of these Matters. And as Mr. Chubb hath (I think not undeservedly) the Reputation of a Person of uncommon Penetration and Depth of Thought, I was the more dispos'd to consider what he had offer'd upon these Subjects.

Before we enter upon Particulars I would observe in general, that Mr. Chubb's Arguments are for the most part levell'd against some particular Circumstances relating to the Doctrine of Christ's making

making Satisfaction for the Sins of Men ; and proceed upon a partial View, without taking in the whole of the case as it is set forth in Scripture. This certainly is an unfair way of proceeding where it is design'd ; but this I don't charge him with, I really don't think it to be so ; however, it must unavoidably lead into Mistakes, because 'tis not judging upon a true State of the Case. Every one must be sensible what a vast Difference one single Circumstance may make. The most ingenious Men are sometimes liable to this sort of Inadvertency ; perhaps more subject to it than others who have not that Vivacity of Thought, or that Penetration of Mind, in observing a Difficulty or Objection that may seem to lie in the Way. When these Men of deeper Thought perceive a Difficulty, which others it may be have not seen or taken notice of, their Mind is so intent upon that, and it may be pleased with it, that they attend not as they ought to do to the full Stating of the Case ; and too easily overlook that which might, if duly consider'd, have removed the Difficulty they are at present so much taken up with. But by whatever Means it hath so happen'd, I think it is evident that Mr. *Chubb* in several of his Objections hath left out some very essential part of the Doctrine ; and the absurd Consequences with which he would load the Doctrine of Christ's making Satisfaction, flow merely from some particular part of the Doctrine separated from the rest ; and entirely vanish when the whole of the Case is fairly represented, as may more fully appear hereafter. But let us hear what he says of the Matter. He is very free and bold in his Censure.

“ To suppose that Divine Justice must be satisfied before the Sinner can be acquitted ; and that
 “ Divine Justice was satisfied by the Suffering and
 “ Death

“ Death of Christ, and that thereby the Divine
 “ Law was secur’d from Contempt, and God’s
 “ Indignation was shewn against Sin, and likewise
 “ Sin was discouraged; these he reckons so mani-
 “ festly repugnant to Reason, that if it could be
 “ made appear that such Things were contain’d
 “ in the Christian Revelation, then that would
 “ be an evident Proof that that Revelation could
 “ not possibly be divine (*p.* 16.—20.) but he
 “ thinks that cannot be done; and when it’s said,
 “ *Christ redeemed us to God by his Blood*, that and
 “ the like such Expressions are plainly Figures of
 “ Speech which were not intended to be a Founda-
 “ tion or Support for any such Doctrine.” We
 have given a large Account of several Passages of
 Scripture relating to this Matter; and must leave
 it to the Reader to judge of them. As for my
 own part, I can never persuade myself, that any
 Man upon reading the New Testament would ever
 have taken the Expressions he finds there for such
Figures of Speech as Mr. Chubb supposes them to be;
 and as intending no more than *Christ’s having laid*
down his Life to maintain his Mission, if he were
 not possess’d with a Notion, that it is *repugnant to*
Reason to understand more by them. Let us see
 then whether there be such a Necessity for this as
 Mr. Chubb apprehends.

It may be some support to a plain honest Chri-
 stian, when he sees with what Confidence Doctrines
 which he apprehends to be plainly taught in Scrip-
 ture, are sometimes represented as manifestly absurd
 and unreasonable; to find that others, who have
 been allow’d by all to be as great Masters of Reason
 as those Men can pretend to be, have not seen such
 Absurdity in those Doctrines; on the contrary,
 have judg’d such Doctrines every way worthy of
 God. It is true, every Man should be, and every
 thinking Person will be determin’d by the Appear-
 ance

ance of Things to his own Mind, and not by the Judgment of others, how highly soever esteemed by him. But it is apt to give one some Uneasiness, when we see Persons of good Understanding widely differing from us, and accounting those Things absurd which we apprehend to be very clear: It raises somewhat of Suspicion and Distrust of my own Judgment, notwithstanding the clear Perception I seem to have. It is, methinks, some Defence against this, to meet with others who may claim as great respect on account of their Capacity, their Application and Impartiality, as any of those who are differently minded, entertaining the same Sentiments with me. Thus when I find such a Man as the late Dr. *Clarke* representing the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction as being evidently the Doctrine of Scripture, and as a glorious Instance of Divine Wisdom, I am so far guarded against being disturb'd at the bold Assertions of others, and am encourag'd to think, that it is not so *manifestly repugnant to Reason* as they apprehend it to be. I may at least think it possible, that those Men have either misapprehended the Doctrine, or else have been mistaken in their arguing upon it, and consequently in their Censures of it. But after all, it must be the Reason of Things that must determine our Judgment; we will therefore consider what hath been urged to make the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction appear so *manifestly repugnant to Reason*.

Mr. *Chubb* begins thus, "Surely nothing can be more repugnant to Reason, than that God should remove his Displeasure from one Person that is guilty, by the Suffering of another that is innocent, because this would be to punish the innocent; that thereby he might take occasion to let the guilty go free; than which nothing can be more unequal and unreasonable," (p. 16.)

G. 3.

• Here

Here it may be observ'd, Mr. *Chubb* leaves out one very material Circumstance, which would make the Matter appear in a very different Light from that in which he represents it, *i. e.* that this suffering of the innocent Person is with his own consent by his voluntary taking it upon himself. This indeed he takes notice of afterwards, and asserts that this doth not alter the Case; how justly we shall see presently. Now I grant, nothing could be more unequal and unreasonable than to punish the Innocent, that thereby the Guilty may go free, by mere arbitrary Will and Pleasure. But if an innocent Person freely offers to take the Punishment upon himself that the other may be excus'd; and the supreme Governor, to whom belongs the Right of punishing or pardoning, admit of this Exchange; surely this makes a vast Alteration in the Case, though Mr. *Chubb* peremptorily denies it. "To say that the Person who suffers voluntarily undertook to bear that Burden, doth not alter the Case at all." These are his Words; which I must own appear'd to me very surpris'ing; for I cannot help thinking that it makes as palpable an Alteration in the Case, as can well be conceiv'd between one Case and another. In the former every one sees an Injury done to the innocent Person; in the other there is not the least Appearance of Injustice. But let us hear Mr. *Chubb's* Reason, "It makes no Alteration in the Case, because it makes no real Alteration either in the Sufferer or in the Sinner. *i. e.* neither of them is more or less guilty or innocent upon that account." But though it makes no alteration in the Persons in this respect; which indeed no one can conceive it should; *i. e.* it is still true, and ever will be so, the one had sinned; and the other had not sinn'd; yet certainly it makes an Alteration as to the Point of inflicting Suffering upon him who had

had not sinn'd; and may make an Alteration in the Case of letting him that sinned go free. With respect to the former, would have been flagrant Injustice to have punish'd him without his Consent; but is no Injustice at all, when the innocent Person for wise and good Reasons is desirous to take that Punishment upon himself; no more than in one Man's taking another's Loss upon him, and discharging his Debt. With respect to the latter also, there may be an Alteration in the Case, *i. e.* it may be conceiv'd not fit and proper to let him that sinned go free without the other's voluntary Suffering in his stead; when yet upon that Consideration it may be fit. Or however, as here is no Injustice in the Case (Mr. Chubb will not say 'tis an Injury to the Guilty not to punish him;) he who hath a Right to punish the Guilty, or to let him go free, is certainly at liberty to let him go free, if he thinks fit, upon this Consideration. And if this be what he means by God's *removing his Displeasure*, the letting the guilty go free; which is indeed what ought to be meant by it; what is there repugnant to Reason in such a Proceeding, any more than there would be in letting him go free without any one's suffering at all?

I can grant to Mr. Chubb, that "as it is Sin
" which renders the Sinner the proper Object of
" God's Displeasure; so the Sinner must and will
" continue to be the proper Object of Displea-
" sure, till his Person is so changed (which is
" done by Repentance and Amendment of Life
" as renders him personally the proper Object of
" God's Mercy." For I know of no Text in
the New Testament which says, that Christ hath
obtained Redemption for obstinate impenitent Sin-
ners; or which intimates that God ever thought
it becoming him to shew Mercy to such; but in-

deed the quite contrary. This I imagine will do him little Service: 'Tis what follows, I presume, must bear the Strefs of the Argument, *viz.* that
 “ When the Sinner is thus personally changed as
 “ that he becomes the proper Object of God’s
 “ Mercy hereby; then it is that personal Change
 “ in him, and that only, and not any Thing
 “ which is done and suffer’d in and by the Person
 “ of another, which can in Reason be the Ground
 “ of God’s Mercy and Forgiveness to him.” But
 this is *gratis dictum*. It doth not follow as a necessary Consequence from any Thing he had said before; nor is it so self evident as to need no Proof. Repentance and Amendment may be a necessary Qualification for an Object of Mercy: *i. e.* It may not be becoming God to shew Mercy to a Sinner without Repentance and Amendment; but surely it doth not follow from thence, that God is oblig’d to shew Mercy to every penitent Sinner. Now if his Repentance and Amendment do not entitle him or give him a Claim to Forgiveness, (and truly a Demand or Claim of Forgiveness, except upon a previous Promise, is in my Apprehension, an Inconsistency:) if, I say, this alone do not give him a Title to Forgiveness, or make it necessary for God to shew Mercy; then this cannot be affirmed to be in Reason the only Ground of God’s Mercy; but there may, for any Thing that as yet appears to the contrary, be some other Ground of God’s Mercy or Forgiveness: And this the Scripture declares to be, *somewhat done or suffer’d in or by the Person of another.* The Matter in short comes to this, doth the Repentance and Amendment of a Sinner make it necessary for God to shew Mercy? If he means this by its *rendring him personally the proper Object of God’s Mercy*; this I deny. And if he means no more, than that the Sinner is not fit to be an Object of Mercy, till he

he do repent and amend; this I can grant him: But from hence he can never inter, that God may not require somewhat farther before he do shew Mercy and grant Forgiveness.

Mr. *Chubb* proceeds, “ And to say that divine Justice must be satisfied before the Sinner can be acquitted, is to make the Case still worse, because then there can be no room nor place for God’s Mercy to be exercis’d at all.” This and his farther reasoning upon this Head, doth not at all, as far as I can perceive, affect the Scripture Account of Christ’s being *deliver’d for our Sins*; and may be pass’d over, as arguing only against the Impropriety of a Phrase or Expression which some Men have us’d; or at most as only shewing that some have not given a rational Account of the Matter. Tho’ indeed, I think, the Absurdity he would fix upon the *satisfying Justice* is built upon a Sense of the Phrase different from what they intend by it. I don’t know that the most strenuous Defenders of God’s vindictive Justice, and of the Necessity of a Satisfaction, have ever asserted, that another Person’s suffering in the Room of the Offender was all that Justice could have demanded; or that God was obliged in Justice to accept of this when it was offer’d; tho’ they maintain that Justice did require so much; or that God as the righteous Governor could not dispense with the Suffering the Penalty when the Law was broken; this being answer’d by another’s suffering in the Room of the Offender, Justice is satisfied, *i. e.* it hath that which it did insist on and require as necessary; and so can give leave (if I may so express it) that the Sinner himself be freed from Punishment. Now the admitting this Substitution, which they don’t suppose God was in Justice oblig’d to do, they conceive may very fairly be

G 5

reckon’d.

reckon'd an Act of Mercy to the Sinner, and all the happy Consequences of it as so many Instances of Grace and Mercy. But whether such a Phrase may be proper or not, doth not much concern us, since this is not the Language of Scripture. Nor doth his reasoning upon this Head (as was observ'd before) in the least affect the Doctrine of Christ's dying for our Sins. For let us but make the Supposition, that God did resolve or determine with himself that the guilty Creature should not be exempted from Punishment without some Person's suffering in Order to the shewing his Displeasure against Sin; I am not now asserting the Fact, nor enquiring whether such Resolution might be becoming God; I only put the Case; suppose it to have been so, and that God did accept of another's suffering for this Purpose, and hereupon freed the Sinner himself from suffering the Punishment he had deserv'd: Can any one pretend that here is no Favour shewed to the Sinner; or that the pardoning him in such a Way, is not an Act of Mercy? Especially, when we add to this, that the other Person who suffers for this Purpose, is of God's own procuring and not the Sinner's. In such Case, I think that Man must be very perverse and ungrateful who would not acknowledge himself beholden to Mercy, And the Scripture doth very consistently join these together, our being *justified freely by the Grace of God*, and that this is *through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ*.

What he adds in the next Paragraph, "that the punishing the innocent is in itself manifestly unreasonable and unjust; and to consider one unjust Action as a Satisfaction to God for another, is very absurd;" hath, I think, been sufficiently obviated already; what he adds farther in the following Section (p. 18.) would be a Home-thrust indeed,

indeed, if it should appear that the Doctrine we defend was justly liable to the Charge; "such a Procedure is so far from securing the Law from Contempt, that on the contrary it renders both the Law and the Lawgiver contemptible: For as the Justice and Equity of the Law consists in punishing the Transgressor of that Law, and the Transgressor only, and in proportioning the Punishment to the Demerit of the Crime; so to punish the innocent in the Place of the guilty is contrary to Justice and Equity; and consequently it renders both the Law and the Law-giver contemptible. One great End of all Law and Punishment is to secure Obedience to the Law: But if the natural Order of Things is thus perverted by treating the innocent as the guilty, and the guilty as innocent, then Obedience is left unguarded and unsecur'd, and Law and Punishment become only Stalking Horses to the Passion and Resentment of the Law-giver." I have given this Passage at full Length, because it hath an Appearance of somewhat very formidable; and it would be so in Reality, if the Doctrine we suppose to be contain'd in the New Testament, did indeed represent God as proceeding in the Manner here describ'd; *i. e.* treating the innocent as the guilty, and the guilty as innocent promiscuously, and merely to gratify an arbitrary Humour or Passion and Resentment, without any Regard to the Merit or Demerit of the Person. But our asserting that Christ died for ~~Sins, the just for the unjust~~, or the Doctrine of Satisfaction as before explain'd, carries in it, I may venture to say, the very Reverse of what Mr. Chubb would here fix upon it. The Maintainers of that Doctrine do as strongly (and as far as I can perceive, as consistently) insist on the Necessity of sincere Repentance in

Order
,

Order to our obtaining Forgiveness, as Mr. *Chubb* can do. If we farther say, that God would not admit even penitent Sinners to Favour without the Interposition of so glorious a Person as his only begotten Son on their behalf; yea, and that God requir'd of him, that he should suffer the Penalty originally denounced in the Law against Transgressors, & for a Demonstration of the Regard God had to the Honour of the Law which had been broken; doth this give any Ground to conclude, that God hath no Regard to the demerit of Sinners, that the guilty may henceforth have as good Chance to escape Punishment as the innocent, yea, and the innocent stand as bad a Chance for suffering the Punishment due only to Transgressors, as those that have transgress'd and continue obstinate in their Transgressions? A strange Inference indeed!

Here it is observed, that it may be said on the contrary. "that God, the supreme Governor, did every Thing that he could do, excepting interposing miraculously, to save this innocent Person's Life. He commanded the *Jews* not to kill or hurt him; he ordered them to reverence him. He did every Thing but force them, to with-hold their wicked Hands from being embued in his Blood. And doth this direct us to consider the Death of this Innocent and glorious Person as an Indication of God's Justice, of his hatred to Sin, and Resolution to have somebody suffer Death for it, before it be forgiven." I think this doth not at all affect the Case. God knew for certain that ~~they would kill his Son in that Manner~~: By the determinate Counsel and Foreknowledge of God he was deliver'd into their Hands. Now it being determin'd by the Counsel of God, that he should suffer in this Way; and it being declared that he was deliver'd up to this *for our Offences*; it was as truly a Suffering for Sin, as if any Persons had been actually commanded to put him to death; or as if he had died by an immediate Stroke of the Hand of God.

indeed! yea rather what perverse and unaccountable Abuse? Methinks they had much more Appearance of Reason on their Side, who said, *let us continue in Sin that Grace may abound*: Here was some Pretence, because really the greater the Guilt the greater the Grace would be in pardoning: But for any to conclude, that God will have no Regard to the Sanctions of his Law, from that very Instance wherein he hath shewed the highest Regard thereto, is just as if a Man should resolve to argue that it's Night because the Sun shines.

It is true Christ suffer'd *the just for the unjust*; so the Scripture speaks; But how came he to suffer? was it upon account of his being just? or was it by means of God's inflicting Evils or Punishments, (if in such Case they might be call'd Punishments) at random, like the *Pool throwing Firebrands, Arrows and Death*, not caring where they fall, whether upon good or bad? No; the Scripture is as plain in declaring Sin to have been the

² It may be said, "He suffer'd Death because he was just, since he might have escaped if he had been unjust." It is plain that I am here considering Christ's Sufferings as brought upon him by the Appointment of God: Now it's certain that it was not for his being just, but for our Offences he was deliver'd up unto Death. *He died for Sins, the just, for the unjust*. It is queried, "where is it said that God inflicted Pain on him as a Token of his Displeasure against Sin? God did deliver him up, just as he did harden Pharaoh's Heart, and as he is said to have restrained the Heart from his Fear." This I think hath been sufficiently consider'd already. I shall only say here, that in my Apprehension those Words of the Prophet, *He was wounded for our Transgressions; the Chastisement of our Peace was upon him; the Lord laid upon him the Iniquities of us all; it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to Grief*, these Declara-

3 tions

the Occasion or the Cause of his Suffering, as it is in declaring that he himself was free from Sin. Well then, let us take the Case as the Scripture represents it: The Sufferings Christ underwent were upon the Account of Sin; God deliver'd him up to them, or, if you will, inflicted them upon him as a token of his Displeasure against Sin. Mr. *Chubb* may perhaps look upon this as a very unapt and foolish Way of God's shewing his Displeasure against Sin; I am not now debating that Matter, but only considering the Fact as represented in Scripture: Only let me say, I believe with the Apostle that the *Foolishness of God is wiser than Men*: The Question now is, whether from the Case as represented in Scripture, there be any Foundation for Mr. *Chubb's* Inferences. Let me fairly propose the Matter, and then let any one judge. I believe, according to the Account the Scripture gives of Christ's Sufferings, that God, in Testimony of his Displeasure against Sin, requir'd that Christ his Son should suffer the Penalty threaten'd in the Law, when he determin'd to shew Mercy to Sinners. God declares expresly and abundantly that what Christ

sut-
tions, I say, do as plainly represent, as could well be, the Evils he suffer'd as inflicted by God in token of his Displeasure against Sin, whoever might be the Instruments of his Sufferings. What more common in the Prophets than to speak of the Calamities brought upon the People of *Israel* by the Injustice and Violence of Men as the Judgments of God upon them? The Cruelty of ~~their Enemies was a divine Punishment~~; they were the *Rod of his Anger*. And tho' it should be granted that with Respect to any *physical Act* of God, he had no more a Hand in the Sufferings of Christ than he hath in hardening Men's Hearts; yet I think in a moral Consideration, i. e. with respect to Design and Appointment, there is a vast difference. It was the Will of God that Christ should suffer, and Christ's giving himself up to those Sufferings was the highest Act of Obedience.

suffer'd was upon this Account: Is it possible now that from this which I see God design'd as an Instance of his just Resentment and of his insisting on the Righteous Sanction of his Law; that I say, from this very thing I should conclude that God hath no Regard to his Law or to the Demerit of Sin? God laid these Sufferings upon his Son, when he voluntarily undertook to stand in the Room of Sinners; after this he declares to the World, that Christ's having suffer'd in the Room of Offenders, shall be of avail for the exempting from Punishment all such as do sincerely repent and return to God, and for none but such; shall I, can any one conclude from thence, that innocent Persons at all Times have as much Reason to fear God's bringing Vengeance upon them, as the most obstinately guilty? Let the Case be fairly represented, I am perswaded no Man in his Senses would upon this Account be apprehensive of any such Consequences. Nor do I believe there ever was a Man in the World under the least Fear, tho' he believ'd these Doctrines, that God would proceed in such a Manner with his Creatures.

I should think the only Colour of Pretence for wicked Men's encouraging the Hopes of Impunity from this Proceeding of God, would be this; that God having sufficiently shewn his Resentment against Sin in the Sufferings of Christ, he may accept of this vicarious Suffering, without insisting upon any ~~Repentance or Reformation~~ of the Sinner. But it's well known the Scripture hath most expressly and abundantly guarded against any such Thought. Or it might perhaps be suggested farther, that as God was pleased to admit of Christ's suffering for the Breach of the original Law; so he may possibly admit of his, or another's Suffering some time hereafter for those who will not be converted

converted by the Gospel. I need not say that the New Testament hath also sufficiently guarded against any such Hope. Not to observe, that the rejecting the Offer of Pardon through the Blood of Christ upon the equitable Terms of the Gospel, must of itself naturally lead any Man to conclude, that with respect to such, according to that awful Declaration of the Writer to the *Hebrews*, *There remaineth no more Sacrifice for Sin, but a certain fearful Looking for of Judgment, and fiery Indignation, which shall devour the Adversaries.*

To conclude this Argument, it's certain those who have believed that Christ died for our Sins, and in our Stead, have always thought this a Demonstration of God's Displeasure against Sin, and have so represented it; but this very Thing, in Mr. *Chubb's* Apprehension, much more naturally leads Men to conclude, that God is not at all concern'd to punish the Guilty; and may tempt them to think, that the Innocent and the Guilty are equally in danger, *i. e.* the Innocent in as much danger as the Guilty, of being made the Objects of his Displeasure. Which of the Two is the more natural Conclusion from the Doctrine of Satisfaction, as above explain'd, let every one judge.

But Mr. *Chubb* seems to think, that it is scarcely Sense to speak of God's being displeased with Sin, or shewing his Indignation against it. "Sin," says Mr. *Chubb*, ~~when consider'd abstractedly~~ "from the Sinner, is a mere empty abstracted Notion, and as such cannot be the Object either of Favour or Displeasure. It is not Sin when consider'd abstractedly; but it is the Sinner, or the Person who is guilty of Sin, who is the Object of Displeasure." It is true, neither Sin nor Virtue can have any Subsistence but in
some

some Person; yet it hath been reckon'd no Impropriety to speak of the Love of Virtue and Goodness, and the like, or of an Hatred and Abhorrence of Vice. Such kind of Expressions are frequently to be met with in other Authors as well as in the sacred Writings. And I think it may very properly be said, that the Abhorrence of Sin is the Ground of the Displeasure or Indignation that is conceiv'd against the Sinner. And this being the Foundation of God's Indignation against the Person, or as Mr. *Chubb* himself expresses it, *Sin being that which renders the Sinner the Object of his Displeasure*, Sin may certainly, with just Propriety be consider'd, as in itself, an Object of Displeasure and of Hatred; and truly it is easy to conceive, that there may be Love and Pity to the Sinner at the same Time that there is the utmost Abhorrence and Displeasure against Sin; and if so, where is the Absurdity? or, What is the Inconsistency, in supposing that God may at the same Time shew a compassionate Regard to Sinners, and a just Displeasure against Sin? I am satisfied every good Man knows by what he feels in himself, that these do not interfere; he finds they subsist together in his own Breast. And methinks I perceive very clearly, how the blessed God hath in this Method of Reconciliation given scope, as I may say, to both these Inclinations, or Dispositions, or Virtues (call 'em by what Name you please) which do essentially belong to the Divine Nature, Compassion to Sinners, and Indignation against Sin, I perceive, I say, the Exercise of both these, in *delivering up Christ for our Offences*; or as the Prophet expresses it, *in laying upon him the Iniquities of us all, that by his Stripes we might be healed*.

The inflicting Evil or Punishment, being consider'd as a Token of Displeasure against Sin, is
 equally

equally so, whether inflicted upon the guilty Person himself, or upon another in his stead; provided it be publicly declared both by him that inflicts it, and by him who suffers, that it is purely upon that Account that these Sufferings are laid upon him. One that hath transgressed suffers Punishment; by this God shews that Sin is that which his Soul hateth; for we know God takes no Pleasure in the Misery of his Creatures; it is upon the Account of Sin that God inflicts Evil. Well, but when one hath transgressed, an innocent Person offers himself to bear the Punishment: God admits the Substitution; he inflicts the Punishment upon the innocent Person; and this is known to be purely upon the Account of this Person's standing in the Place of the Offender. Now, I say, the inflicting the Evil or the Punishment is as plainly an Instance of Displeasure against Sin, in this Case as in the other. And this may give us a Notion of *transferring Guilt*, a Phrase sometimes used in Discourses upon this Subject; which is not indeed a Phrase the Scripture makes use of any more than that of *Satisfaction*; though there are Phrases very much like it, as that of God's *laying upon him the Iniquities of us all*; his *bearing our Sins in his own Body upon the Tree*, &c. As Guilt denotes the being liable to Suffering upon account of some Transgression, when another Person, with the Consent and Approbation of him to whom belongs the Right of inflicting Punishment, takes upon him to suffer the Penalty denounced in the Law against such Transgression in the room of the Offender; it may, I should think, properly enough be said, *This Person takes the other's Guilt upon him*. But I am not concern'd for any particular Phrase; the Thing itself which I contend for, I think, is very intelligible, *viz.* that a Person who had never offended may suffer by his own Consent, and with the Approbation of

of the supreme Lawgiver, in the place and stead of one who had transgressed; and in that case, the Suffering of the innocent Person is as truly a *suffering for Sin* and in itself as directly and explicitly a *Token of the supreme Governor's Displeasure against Sin*, as if the Transgressor himself had suffer'd in his own Person. ^b

But

^b It is objected, " That however clear it may be in *Debitis*, that one may be allow'd to pay what another owes; yet in *Delictis* it is not easy to be perceived, how my insisting that an innocent Person who never committed the Fault should suffer Pain before I will pardon the guilty Person who did commit it, does, or possibly can, shew my hatred and irconcilable Displeasure against the fault. In Punishments the Person, and not an abstract Notion, is the proper Object of a wise Governor's Displeasure: To this Dr. Owen agrees, who says, That personal Guilt differs from Debts in this, That the Person himself is principally intended and aimed at, whereas in the other Case, the Debt and not the Person is chiefly aimed at." Vicarious Punishments are indeed rarely known among Men: There may be very good Reasons why they should not be ordinarily allow'd of: In capital Cases it may be question'd whether they could in Justice be admitted; because it may be question'd, whether any Man hath Power over his own Life to offer it in the room of an Offender. But the Thing in itself consider'd (supposing that it might be allow'd of) is very intelligible; and certainly may be admitted by the Authority of the supreme Lord and Judge of the World; and in so great a Concern, as the *reconciling the World unto himself*, was in my Apprehension, highly becoming the Divine Wisdom, as I have endeavoured to demonstrate. I have before allow'd a clear Distinction between *debita* and *delicta*; though the guilty Person, as hath been observ'd, is the proper Object of Displeasure; yet certainly it is hatred of the Crime, and displeasure against that, which is the Ground of Displeasure against the Person: *The righteous Lord loveth*
1 Righ-

But let us take Mr. Chubb's Way ; God's Displeasure is against Sinners ; now, says Mr. Chubb, " It is exceeding absurd to suppose, that God's Indignation can be shown against Sinners by his excusing the Guilty from Punishment, and by his afflicting and punishing an innocent Person in their stead, because the Action itself naturally and necessarily shews the contrary, *i. e.* it shews, if it shews any Thing, God's Dislike of the Innocent, and his Approbation of the Guilty." And indeed, if it doth shew this, I shall agree with him, that " this would be so far from discouraging, that on the contrary, it would rather be an Encouragement to Sin." I need not observe here, which hath been taken notice of before

Righteousness, and therefore doth his Countenance behold the Upright. In like manner Sin is that which his Soul hateth, and therefore he hateth all the Workers of Iniquity. Consequently as far as this is regarded and aimed at in inflicting Punishment, I mean the testifying a Displeasure against Sin this is manifested when it is declared and known, that the Evil or Suffering is inflicted for, and upon account of the Crime committed, wherever that Evil or Suffering falls ; provided it be in a Way consistent with Justice. I may add, as Punishment is designed *in terrorem* (which indeed is scarce to be separated from the other Consideration) it may in this way serve that purpose also. I think I have as clear a Notion of the following Proposition, as I have of any Proposition relating to the Actions of God. God inflicts Evil or Suffering to shew his dislike of Sin, and to deter Men from sinning ; consequently, whenever he inflicts Evil or Suffering, and at the same Time declares that it is inflicted upon account of Sin, that Suffering is a Testimony of his Displeasure against Sin, and design'd to deter others. Now, I think, nothing can be more express than the Declarations of Scripture concerning the Sufferings of Christ, that they were upon account of Sin.

before, that the excusing the Guilty from Punishment upon account of Christ's Suffering in their stead, is the excusing no other guilty Persons than those whom Mr. Chubb himself allows; that the Mercy of God doth excuse; and whom indeed he supposes the Mercy of God must excuse from Punishment. Mr. Chubb says, If we confess and forsake our Sins God will forgive us our Sins. We say farther with the Apostle, that when we do confess and forsake our Sins, it is *the Blood of Jesus Christ the Son of God that cleanseth us from all our Unrighteousness*. Doth this Addition, concerning the Way wherein penitent Sinners, and none but such, obtain Mercy, give Encouragement to Sinners to continue impenitent? "Yea, says Mr. Chubb, this "very Action, *viz.* the afflicting and punishing "the Innocent in the room of the Offender, naturally and necessarily shews God's Dislike of the "Innocent, and Approbation of the Guilty." *i. e.* Because God is so displeased with the Sinner that he will not receive him into Favour, even upon his humble Confession and sincere Repentance, unless his own Son suffer the Penalty denounced against Transgressors, for a Demonstration of the Regard God hath to the righteous Sanction of his Law; we may hence infer, that God is not displeased with Sinners, but approves their Conduct. And when God declares that the Evil inflicted upon this innocent Person is not upon account of any Displeasure against him; yea, that he is highly pleased with his submitting to it, and testifies this by conferring upon him the most glorious Reward; Mr. Chubb will conclude from such an Action as this, "That God dislikes the innocent Person "while he approves of the Guilty; that 'tis a Matter of Indifferency to God, so he doth but punish, whether he punish the Guilty or the Innocent; or rather, that the greatest Mark of "Respect

“ Respect is shewn to the Transgressor, because
 “ he punishes the Innocent and lets the Guilty go
 “ free.” It is true, Love and Pity are shewn to
 the Guilty in providing an innocent Person to suf-
 fer in their stead, when it was thought fit to insist
 on this in order to their being freed from the Pe-
 nalty; and we do allow that herein is a higher De-
 monstration of Love to Sinners than could be by
 shewing Mercy upon mere Repentance; so it is
 represented in Scripture. But will Mr. *Cbubb* say,
 that Love and Pity to an Offender shew that there is
 no Resentment of the Violation of the Law, no
 Dislike of Sin? I suppose Mr. *Cbubb* will grant us,
 that the forgiving penitent Sinners is an Act of
 Mercy and Compassion; will Mr. *Cbubb* allow it
 as a just Consequence from this that God approves
 the Guilty, or that therefore Sinners have no rea-
 son to dread his Displeasure if they continue Impe-
 nitent? But I suppose it is God’s excusing them
 when penitent, *upon account of another’s having suf-*
fered in their stead; this is the Thing which “ na-
 “ turally and necessarily shews, in his Apprehen-
 “ sion, a Dislike of the Innocent, and an Appro-
 “ bation of the Guilty.” But how doth God’s
 requiring that one should suffer in the room of
 the Guilty, before he restore them to his Favour,
 shew his Approbation of the Guilty, as such, any
 more than if he had received them to Mercy with-
 out any Suffering at all? And then as to God’s
Dislike of the Innocent, which also he says *this Action*
naturally and necessarily shows, I shall just state the
 Case, and leave it to every one to judge. God,
 for wise Ends of Government, appoints an innocent
 Person, not without his own free Consent, to stand
 in the room of the Offender; and then inflicts the
 Punishment upon him; but afterwards exalts this
 same Person to the highest Honour, and Glory
 and Happiness, as a Reward for his having volun-
 tarily

tarily submitted to those Sufferings; is it conceivable that any Man should be tempted to conclude from such a Procedure as this, that God is displeased with innocent Creatures, and that the Guilty may expect the greatest Marks of his Respect? Let any Man judge.

I have now done with Mr. Chubb's Objections. I do own, as was intimated before, that according to the partial View he hath taken of some one Particular only, separate from other Things which necessarily belong to the Case under Consideration, his Objections may appear to be of force; *e. g.* while he represents only a *just Person suffering, and the Guilty going free*; if there was nothing farther to be consider'd, and this were to be taken as an Instance of mere arbitrary Will and Pleasure; this indeed might lead one to conclude, that *Obedience or Transgressions were Things indifferent*; that *the Innocent had as much to fear as the guilty, and the Guilty as good chance to escape as the Innocent*. But let any Man take the whole Doctrine together, according to the Account the Scripture gives us, and I may venture to say, let him draw such Conclusions from it if he can.

Upon the whole I do sincerely profess, that notwithstanding any Thing Mr. Chubb hath said, I see nothing in the Doctrine as above represented, that hath the least Appearance of an *evident Proof, that the Christian Redemption, supposing it to contain this Doctrine, cannot possibly be divine*; so far from this, that I rather think this very Doctrine to be an Evidence, that the Gospel is a Divine Revelation: So glorious a Manifestation is there of a Divine Wisdom in this Way of our Redemption, as may satisfy any Man, that it could not be the Contrivance and Invention of the Men who published the Gospel

Gospel Revelation to the World. But of this in the following Chapter.

CH A P. IV.

The Wisdom of God manifested in this Way of our Redemption.

WH E R E is the Wise? says St. Paul; where is the Scribe? Where is the Disputer of this World? Hath not God made foolish the Wisdom of this World? Yea, the Foolishness of God is wiser than Men. One would think it should be no difficult Thing for a Creature, such a short-sighted Creature as Man is, to acquiesce in the Methods God sees fit to take, though we could not see the Reason of them. For any one obstinately to refuse an advantageous Offer made to him by a wise and good Man, only because he imagin'd the Person who makes the Offer might have taken a more proper way to have conferr'd the Favour, who would not account this an Excess of Folly? But put the Case, that it was an Offer of Life from an offended Sovereign to a Criminal, than to stand disputing about the Wisdom of his Sovereign in taking such a particular Way of shewing Mercy, especially when it lays no Hardship upon him, should we not think the Man was out of his Senses?

It is true, Man may do a foolish Thing; God cannot; it may be thought therefore, that the Appearance of Foolishness in any Thing that pretends to come from God, is a better Argument against it, than the same could be against any Thing proposed by Men. I grant that a Demonstration of Foolishness in any Proceeding is as good an Argument against its being a Contrivance of

God

God, as a Demonstration of Injustice. God can no more do a foolish Thing than he can do any Thing that is wicked or unjust. But how shall we form that Demonstration, unless we can be sure that we have a perfect View of the whole Matter, of all the Ends and Reasons that God had in View; or else, saw plainly some Inconsistency in the Method, so far as it lay open to our view? For this very Reason, because God is wiser than Man, infinitely wiser than Man, we are the less capable of judging of the Fitness of his Proceedings in innumerable Instances; and we have so much more reason to expect, that oftentimes his Judgments should be to us unsearchable, and his Ways past our finding out. No wonder that a Creature should often have Occasion for that Exclamation, *Oh the Depth of the Riches, both of the Wisdom and of the Knowledge of God!* Nothing therefore can be more weak, to say the least, than to make our not apprehending the Fitness of a Thing a Pretence for rejecting the plainest Evidence of the Fact, when God declares it to be a Method he hath fixed upon. By the same way of arguing, I fear we should be obliged to deny several Things in the World we dwell in to be God's Creatures; or to deny that he regards, or so much as knows several Things that happen in this lower World. I have taken some Notice of this before, but I hope I shall be excused for touching upon it again. It seems to be coming very much into fashion among the Men of Reason, especially the Opposers of Revelation, to make their Judgment of the Fitness of Things, a Rule for deciding even against the plainest Evidence of Facts, or the plainest Expressions of Writers, in Matters where divine Authority is concern'd; a way of proceeding which I am apt to think these Gentlemen would resent as insolent behaviour in any Servant of theirs. But to drop the Charge of

H Presumption

Presumption and Arrogance; I propose it to them as Men of Reason, whether it is not very possible to be conceiv'd, that God in some Cases may judge that to be fit and proper, which they would not judge to be so; and whether God may not reveal to Men his Counsels and Determinations, and require their Compliance, without letting them into the Views he had in taking such Methods.

As I said before, I do not insist on these Things as if we were under any Necessity of having Recourse to such Considerations with Respect to the Case before us. On the contrary it appears to me very evident, that in the Method of our Recovery set forth in the Gospel, God hath *abounded towards us in all Wisdom and Prudence*; inasmuch as he hath given at the same time a most glorious Display of his Love and Pity to Sinners, and also of his irreconcilable Aversion to Sin: Both the one and the other shine forth to my Understanding with a much brighter Lustre in this Way of our Reconciliation, than they could possibly do by receiving Sinners to Mercy upon bare Repentance and Amendment.

If Christ's suffering for Sin be really a token of God's just Indignation against Sin; this, I say, being granted, and I think it hath been made very plain, there can be no room for Dispute upon the first Point. If the requiring Repentance, or the not forgiving without Repentance ~~and Amendment~~ be a Testimony of God's dislike of Sin; the requiring an Atonement, such an Atonement over and above that, is surely a farther Testimony or Token or Demonstration of his Dislike of Sin: To debate this, I think, would be just the same Thing as to debate whether the

the requiring a Pound be not more than the demanding a Penny.

But I have somewhat farther to offer upon this Head, which perhaps is not so commonly taken Notice of, but which to me appears to be of some considerable Weight in the Case before us; and indeed, in my Apprehension, makes it appear most evidently fit and proper, that God should insist on some Way of Atonement, when he shew'd Mercy to sinful Men. And he that is convinc'd of this, I am perswaded will easily come into the Notion of the Fitness of that Atonement which, the New Testaments tells us, God hath provided. I can't say indeed that I should have fallen into such a Way of thinking, if I had not found it in Revelation: Tho' the universal spread of the Notion of expiatory Sacrifices seems to imply somewhat natural in it; of which before. However, as I find in divine Revelation that God did see fit to require an Atonement, it appears to me a Scheme highly becoming the supreme Governor of the World.

For let it be consider'd, 'tis not barely the passing by one single Offence, or the multiplied Provocations of one single Offender; but Reconciliation with a whole World of Offenders at once: And this Reconciliation to take place by the passing, if I may so express it, one single Act of Indemnity. Here is a standing Law, if I may so call it, a standing Law of Reconciliation, to be in Force for all Times, even from the first entrance of Sin through the whole Duration of this World, for the Benefit of all without Exception, notwithstanding the most heinous Provocations, and these never so often repeated, never so long continued in; upon their complying with the Terms proposed. A King may pardon some great Offender, or

a Company of Rebels, and be applauded for his Clemency: But should a Prince make it a standing Law of the Kingdom, that henceforward when any one had been guilty of Rebellion, he should never fail of Forgiveness upon his Repentance, yea tho' he relapsed never so often; I suppose no Man would admire his Wisdom. I can't but think every one must perceive a vast Difference between such a standing universal Law as we have mention'd, and the passing an Act of Indemnity upon Occasion of some particular Insurrection, or the like. ^b But now the Case of this Apostate World requires such an universal standing Law of Reconciliation as hath been represented: This, it must be own'd, at first View, seems plainly to give too great Allowance and Encouragement to Sin: What better Guard could there be against this, than what we are now speaking of; *i. e.* that the supreme Governor of the World should at the same Time give some remarkable sensible Testimony of his Displeasure against Sin, and Demonstration of a terrible Vengeance to be taken upon all who will not be wrought upon by the Offers of Mercy and Grace? This I think he hath done in the most effectual Manner that can be conceiv'd, by appointing such a Person to die for our Sins, and requiring

^b It hath been said, " what would be folly in an human Governor may be wise in an all-knowing and " almighty Governor." It may be so, but we are not to conclude ~~that it is so in any Case~~ without some apparent Reason for such a different Judgment; unless God himself hath determin'd, either by his own acting, which we are sure is always with Wisdom; or by some Declaration to that purpose. I would have it observ'd that I do not propose this as an Absurdity which must have obliged us to conclude that God could not have acted thus; but upon a View of the Method God hath taken, this Consideration among others, makes it appear to be a wise Conduct.

quiring the Sinner, in all his Approaches to God, to come by him as the Mediator and Advocate.

Who that considers the Dignity of this Person as described in the New Testament, *The Brightness of the Father's Glory, the express Image of his Person; He by whom God made the Worlds;* the near Relation he stands in to God: *His only-begotten Son, who was in the Bosom of the Father, and had Glory with him before the World was;* to consider, I say, this Person by the Appointment of God taking a Body and suffering Death for our Sins; to see God laying upon him the Iniquities of us all, and as the Prophet expresses it, *bruising him for our Sins;* surely this, if any Thing, must raise in every Mind the most lively Apprehensions of God's Displeasure against Sin that can be suppos'd to be raised in the Minds of Men, while they do not themselves feel the Weight of divine Wrath and Vengeance. Can there be conceiv'd any thing that could have a more natural Tendency to maintain a due Sense of this, when Sinners themselves were to be exempted from the Punishment? or that could give a more strong convincing Demonstration to all whose Sins are pass'd by, that it was not from slight Thoughts of Sin that God so readily forgave it, as we might naturally have been tempted to think it so universal a Pardon were proclaim'd and no Notice taken of the Offence? No; here we see in the most affecting Manner that can be, represented the highest Indignation against Sin, tho' he lets the Sinner go free. I think one may venture to say, without taking in the Notion of infinite Satisfaction and infinite Demerit of Sin, that we have in this Way of reconciling Sinners a more illustrious Display of God's Resentment of the Evil of Sin, than if the Sentence had been executed immediately

mediately upon the Transgressors. According to the original Constitution the Penalty was to be inflicted immediately upon our first Parents, *In the Day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die*; and doth there not appear in the Suffering of the Son of God, this being declar'd to be a Suffering *for Sin*, a more glorious Manifestation of the divine Displeasure against Sin than would have been in executing the Sentence upon them? Nay, and what if we should go farther, and set this against the Sufferings that all the sinful Race of Mankind were justly liable to; might not the inconceivably superior Dignity of the Son of God be allow'd as more than a Balance to the Number and the longer Duration of their Sufferings? Those who cannot admit of an Eternity of Torments, will not perhaps make a Difficulty of allowing this. And this being allow'd, here is confessedly as glorious a Display of the divine Displeasure against Sin, while Sin is forgiven and the Sinner obtains Mercy, as there could have been, had Justice been fully executed upon the Sinner, and no Mercy shewn at all. And if so, who will not say, this is a Contrivance worthy of God? But we need not enter into these Speculations. Tho' I cannot but say, when I observe how the great Apostle *St. Paul* is sometimes wrapt up in Admiration of the manifold Wisdom of God in the Dispensation committed to him; representing a Height and Depth, and Length and Breadth of the Love of Christ that passeth Knowledge, it gives a pleasing Hope that we shall have hereafter much more enlarged Views than now we can attain to, of the divine Wisdom in this Way of our Redemption; such as will be doubtless most highly entertaining to all intelligent Minds, and more especially transporting to the Redeemed. But to proceed.

We suppose the Death of Christ, *i. e.* his dying for our Sins according to the Scriptures, to have been a lively Demonstration of God's just Indignation against Sin; but this was a single Transaction, he died and rose again, and must die no more: But now, every Sinner being required to *come by him* unto God, to look to this Blood of sprinkling, to apply to Christ as an Advocate, and to depend upon him as the Propitiation when he comes to make his Peace with God; and in short to have all his Access by this great *High-Priest*; here is the most effectual Way to keep alive in the Soul a Sense of God's Abhorrence of Sin, while he tastes and sees how gracious the Lord is in passing it by. When he comes to receive a Pardon, he sees at the same Time what Sin is; 'tis a Pardon purchased by the Blood of Christ. When he hath most Freedom and Confidence in his Access to God, he hath at the same time a most affecting View of the absolute Purity of that God with whom he hath to do, and a humbling Sense of his own Vileness impress'd upon his Soul; for he sees that 'tis by the Blood of Jesus, that he is brought nigh; he comes in a new and living Way which Christ hath consecrated for him; 'tis the having such an High-Priest that gives him Boldness.

Moreover, every one that hears of this Way of Reconciliation, sees the inflexible Regard God hath to the Honour of his Law, and how concern'd he is to maintain the Dignity of his Government; so that notwithstanding that Excess of Goodness which appears in the standing universal Offer of Pardon to the greatest Offenders whensoever they shall return to God; here is a most awful Conviction of the Desperateness of the Case, if any shall persist obstinately to refuse the Mercy that is now

offer'd; not only as the rejecting this doth inconceivably enhance the Guilt, but, as it excludes all possible Hope of obtaining Forgiveness in any other Way. So the Writer to the *Hebrews*,—
Of how much sorer Punishment shall they be thought worthy, who have trodden under foot the Son of God? &c. If any Man sin wilfully after he hath received the Knowledge of the Truth (of his Truth) there remaineth no more Sacrifice for Sin; but a fearful looking for of Judgment and fiery Indignation which shall devour the Adversaries.

Now if this Atonement, if this Way of our Access to God, do really serve the Purposes above mentioned, we may judge that this was not a mere arbitrary Constitution, but highly fit and becoming, and in some Sense *necessary*; and so I think the Scripture represents it, particularly the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, as we shall shew presently. Nor doth the Fitness of this Method arise merely from the Respect it hath to us, as being a Condescension to the Opinions and Prejudices of Men, and a proper Remedy for the Jealousies and Fears that are apt to rise in a Mind conscious of Guilt, as some seem to have represented it. It must be own'd, great is the Condescension which the blessed God hath been pleas'd to shew upon Occasion to the Weakness and even Prejudices of his Creatures; But I should very much question whether God would think fit to enjoin such Humiliation and Suffering upon his own Son, merely in compliance with an unreasonable and groundless Fancy, that Men had taken up we know not how, of the Necessity of an Atonement, and that by human Sacrifice. One would think any such Prejudice, if it were only a groundless Prejudice, might have been remov'd at a cheaper Rate; and a barbarous Custom founded upon it, have had a Stop
put

put to it in an easier Way. And truly I should think it much more reasonable to believe, that these very Apprehensions Men had of the Necessity of some way of expiating Guilt, and of the Use of Sacrifices for this Purpose, which had taken such deep root every where in the Minds of Men; I should think it, I say, much more reasonable to suppose, that these Notions had their rise from some Intimations from God himself, than to imagine, that the only begotten Son of God was made a Sacrifice, in Compliance with the groundless Fancies of Men.

That this Atonement is a most effectual Remedy for the Fears and Jealousies of an awakened guilty Conscience, will be readily granted; it is propos'd with this View in the New Testament; and no doubt God had a Regard to this. But the *Writer to the Hebrews*, as was hinted before, seems to lead our Views beyond this: There was previous to this a Fitness in the Thing itself, for which Reason it was becoming God as the Governor of the World to take this Way of reconciling the World to himself. This is what I mean by *necessary*; not that God could not in Justice pardon Sin without a Sacrifice, or without such a Sacrifice; for whom would he have wronged in remitting the Punishment? unless it should be said, he would not have been just to himself; an Expression indeed which is sometimes us'd; but strictly speaking, no Person I think can be guilty of Injustice towards himself. It is enough if there were in the Nature of Things, all Circumstances consider'd, such Reasons as might make it most fit and proper. In this Sense, as God cannot be suppos'd to do that which would be unfit for him to do, I think the Scriptures do represent it as a Thing necessary, that Christ should die to make an Atonement for our Sins. Just as the

Opposers of Satisfaction suppose it necessary that God should forgive a penitent Sinner: They cannot say it would be unjust to punish; then Forgiveness would not be an Act of Mercy; but they suppose it would not be consistent with Goodness not to pardon the Offender upon his sincere Repentance and Amendment. So the Scripture leads us to conceive, that for some Reasons it would not have been becoming God to have reconciled the World to himself without making Christ a Sacrifice. And truly God's having fixed upon this Way may somewhat incline one to judge so. *If it can't be infer'd from hence that the same wise Purposes might not have been as effectually answered some other Way;* (Mr. F. p. 328.) yet I think it would much less become any Man to assert on the other Side, *that the same wise Purpose might as effectually have been answer'd some other Way.* The Charge of Boldness and Presumption which some would fix upon those who have asserted the former, seems to lie more strongly against those who shall pretend to assert the latter. But let us hear what the Scripture intimates with relation to this Point.

¹ The Writer to the Hebrews says, *It became him for whom are all Things, and by whom are all Things, in bringing many Sons to Glory, to make the Captain of their Salvation perfect* (or to consecrate him as the Captain of their Salvation) *through Sufferings.* Heb. ii. 10. This is given as the Reason why Jesus by the Grace of God tasted Death for every Man, Ver. 9. *We see Jesus for a little while made lower than the Angels—that he by the Grace of God might taste Death for every Man; FOR it became him for whom are all Things, &c.* Surely the Meaning of that Expression there is not only that there was nothing unbecoming in it; how poor and flat is this? and indeed nothing to the Purpose.

For

For it became him for whom are all Things, and by whom are all Things; the least we can understand by it is, that it was suitable to the Honour and Majesty of the supreme Cause of all; or rather, that it would have been unbecoming his Dignity, to have acted otherwise: As when the same Writer says upon another Occasion, Wherefore he was not ashamed to be called their God, for he hath provided for them a City: which doubtless implies that he would have been ashamed to have been called their God, if he had not so provided for them; it would have been altogether unbecoming that Title or Character: And when he says, such an High-Priest became us who is holy, harmless, &c. I do not bring this Text as a Proof of the Necessity of our having an High-priest, but only to illustrate the Manner of Expression in the Passage before cited; it being determin'd that we should have an High-priest, it was fit, it was requisite, our Case requir'd, that he should be such an one as is there describ'd.

I farther observe that the same Writer uses that very Term *necessary* with respect to this Matter, Chap. ix. Ver. 23. Having observed that *Moses* sprinkled with Blood both the Tabernacle and all the Vessels of the Ministry, and that almost all Things are by the Law purged with Blood, and without shedding of Blood there is no Remission; he adds, *it was therefore necessary (αναγκασιον) that the heavenly Things, should be purified with better Sacrifices than these*: For certainly the Necessity there spoken of doth not refer to the former, tho' they are first mention'd; but to the latter, *It was therefore necessary that the Patterns of Things in the Heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly Things themselves with better Sacrifices than these*; the plain Meaning is, it was necessary that
whereas

whereas the Patterns—the Manner of Expression is just like that in *Rom. vi. Ver. 17. God be thanked that ye were the Servants of Sin; but ye have obeyed, &c.* which no one I suppose understands, as if the Apostle thanked God for their having been the Servants of Sin; no, but that having been, or whereas they had been heretofore the Servants of Sin, now they were become the Servants of Righteousness. Here then we have the sacred Writer asserting in express Words a *Necessity* for the heavenly Things being purified with the Sacrifice of Christ; that that is the *better Sacrifice* he means, no one can doubt; it follows, *for Christ is not enter'd into the holy Places made with Hands, which are the Figures of the true, but into Heaven itself, now to appear in the Presence of God for us.*—Now once in the end of the World hath he appeared, to put away Sins by the Sacrifice of himself.

There is one Passage more in that *Writer* which seems to me very strong for the same Purpose, *Chap. x. Ver. 4. For it is not possible, that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sins.* This Impossibility, it's plain from the whole Series of the arguing in this Place, was not what arose from mere arbitrary Constitution, but from the Nature and Reason of Things: This is the Reason why those were set aside, and a Body prepared for Christ. *The Law, says this Writer, can never with those Sacrifices which they offer Year by Year continually, make the Comers thereunto perfect; but in those Sacrifices there is a Remembrance again made of Sins every Year.* And it could not be otherwise; for, says he, it is not possible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sins. *Wherefore, when he cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifices and Offerings thou wouldest not—but a Body hast thou prepared me. Lo;*

I come

I come to do thy Will, O God—He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which Will we are sanctified, through the Offering of the Body of Christ once for all. Here the Thing proposed was the taking away Sins; this he asserts could not be done by those Sacrifices. But now if Sins might be taken away without any Sacrifice at all; whatever be intended by the taking away Sins; surely God might have appointed these as a Means if he had so pleased: Especially if all Sacrifices were only Memorials, and could be design'd to serve no other Use, it is hard to say, why God was not at Liberty to have appointed these and no other for Memorials; if indeed the Expression taking away Sins as here us'd by this Writer, might with any Manner of Propriety be applied to bare Memorials. But let us consider the Argument, taking in the Supposition of God's requiring some Sacrifice, whether that were an arbitrary Determination or not; so far at least will appear, that, according to this Author's Notion of the Matter, there was a Necessity of some better Sacrifice than those were to answer the purpose of God in requiring a Sacrifice: Those were in their own Nature insufficient, this was proper to answer the Design of God, and had the Effect, which the other could not have upon account of a natural intrinsic Unfitness. The Law can never with those Sacrifices which they offer, make the Comers thereunto perfect. For it is not possible that the Blood of Bulls and Goats should take away Sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the World, he saith, Sacrifice and Offerings thou wouldest not, but a Body hast thou prepared me. Lo, I come to do thy Will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which Will we are sanctified through the Offering of Jesus Christ.—For by one Offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. I have laid the
whole

whole together in one View before the Reader, that he may better judge of the Argument.

I might take notice of some other Passages in the sacred Writings which look this Way; as when St. Paul says, *if Righteousness come by the Law, then Christ is dead in vain.* Gal. ii. ult. and again, Chap. iii. Ver. 21. *If there had been a Law that could have given Life, verily Righteousness had been by a Law.* In the former Passage it is taken for granted; it is supposed every one would readily allow, that God would never have appointed Christ to die, if there had not been some Sort of Necessity for it. In the latter he seems to say that the Reason why Righteousness was not by a Law, was because there could not be a Law that should give Life. Now if God might have forgiven Sin without an Atonement, *i. e.* if it were no ways unbecoming his Perfections so to have done; there might have been a Law that might have given Life; there had been no need of Christ's dying. Let it be observ'd, the Apostle is speaking here, of our obtaining Righteousness or Justification; and I think his arguing plainly amounts to this, that there was need of Christ's dying in order to our obtaining Righteousness.

But if these Passages last mention'd may be thought not so direct to the Purpose, the former in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, I take to be full and clear and strong for the Notion of a Necessity, such a Necessity as we before explain'd, of Christ's dying as a Sacrifice for the Sins of Men. And truly when one considers, as was hinted before, who and what he is; one can scarce help thinking so. How naturally doth this Thought arise. "Sure-
" ly the blessed God would never have enjoyn'd
" this upon a Person so glorious, so dear to him-
" self,

“ felt, if the great Ends propos’d to be accomplish’d by his dying a Sacrifice might have been as well answer’d some other Way; or without requiring any Sacrifice at all.” However, it is enough, if we see many great and glorious Ends served by it. Nor should I have thought that we were at all concern’d to enter into this Question, much less oblig’d to determine that God might not as well have taken some other Way for the making Atonement, or have pardon’d Sinners without an Atonement; had not the Scripture led to this Thought.

Before I dismiss this Head, I would remark, that what hath been said of the Necessity of an Atonement doth not interfere with *the rational Encouragement which it is supposed Men have every where to serve and worship God, in Hope of Acceptance and Mercy, from the great Goodness which he hath demonstrated in the general Constitution of Things and Course of Providence.* (F. p. 329.) What if it were ever so plainly demonstrable that God would accept of a penitent Sinner; would this destroy the Force of those Reasons which make it fit for God to take some Method at the same Time for the testifying his Displeasure against Sin? Both may be true; *i. e.* it is becoming God to shew Mercy to Offenders upon their sincere Repentance; and it is also becoming him to shew a Regard to the Honour of his Law by requiring some Satisfaction for the Transgression. So in fact it hath appeared; we see that God hath contrived a Method for the Exercise of Mercy to the utmost, and for the maintaining the Honour of his Holiness and Justice too.

But the Difficulty I suppose will lie here, “ If it appear that an Atonement is necessary, and we

“ we have no Intimation from God of any such
 “ Atonement provided by him, or of any that
 “ he will accept of; this precludes the Hopes we
 “ might raise from the Appearances of Goodness,
 “ and seems to put an effectual Bar in our Way”.
 I grant this would naturally cast a great Damp
 upon the Hopes of a guilty Creature: And it is a
 great Advantage we have by the Gospel Revela-
 tion, that such an Atonement is clearly manifested
 to us. But possibly, without some Intimations from
 God, the Reason of Men would never have disco-
 vered to them such Necessity of an Atonement;
 and the probable Grounds of Hope, arising from the
 natural Notion of the Mercy of God, and this
 confirmed by the visible Instances of his Goodness
 and Forbearance exercised towards Sinners, would
 be at least equal to any Apprehension they could
 have of his requiring an Atonement, especially
 when he had given no Direction about it. Yea, and
 supposing they might have some Apprehension of
 a Necessity of this, yet neither would this utterly
 extinguish Hope: There might still be some Pro-
 bability in arguing, that God would not have given
 any Encouragement by the Manner of his treat-
 ing Sinners, and would not have requir’d them,
 as certainly he doth, to seek after him; if he had
 not some Way of reconciling his Goodness towards
 them with his Holiness and Justice: We might
 conclude, if not with absolute Certainty, yet with
 some Appearance of Reason, that God would never
 have continued a Race of sinful Creatures under any
 Encouragement of finding Mercy, if the Way
 of Mercy had been utterly shut up: And therefore
 I might hope that there was some Way for the
 Exercise of Mercy consistent with the Honour of
 his Holiness, tho’ I saw it not. Some Probability
 there might be in such Conclusions, which might
 give some Encouragement, even supposing a clear
 Con-

Conviction of the Necessity of an Atonement, without the Knowledge of any such Atonement as would be accepted; which is I think putting the Case in the strongest Manner it can be put. Indeed I look upon the Case of Men in the present State of Things, with respect to the Encouragement they have to hope for Mercy (I speak of such as have no Revelation) as very different from that of the first Transgressors, I mean our first Parents. We perceive nothing of Hope when they came to be sensible of their Guilt, no thought of making Application to Mercy; they are filled with Shame and Confusion and Dread, and run away to hide themselves; in short they seem to have expected nothing but the immediate Execution of the Sentence. But now Men see every where Riches of Forbearance, numberless Instances of Kindness shew'd to Sinners, and God continues them under his moral Government; these Things naturally create a Hope of Mercy and Acceptance upon a sincere Repentance and Return to him. We have a very remarkable Instance of this natural Hope, as I may call it, and the good Success of it, in the Case of the *Ninevites*: A Prophet comes from God with a peremptory Denunciation of Destruction; at least there was no Intimation of Mercy given by the Prophet; but from the natural Notion they had of divine Goodness and Mercy, they say, *who can tell if God will turn and repent, and turn away from his fierce Anger that we perish not?* By this they are encourag'd to humble themselves, and their Humiliation is accepted. *God saw their Works, that they turned from their evil Way; and God repented of the Evil that he had said he would do unto them, and he did it not.* Were it so that a guilty Creature by the Light of Nature could proceed no farther in his Conclusions concerning the Hope of Mercy than these *Ninevites*; it would certainly
 be

be his Duty and his Interest to do all that in him lay to make his Peace with God. And truly I don't know whether a Sinner could go beyond this, upon any sure Grounds, after many notorious wilful Provocations; and especially after repeated Relapses into Sins he had repented of and promis'd to forsake. But do not Sinners need better Encouragement? Who would not be glad of greater Assurance? Blessed be God for the Gospel.

Let me add one Thing more; if the Supposition of the Necessity of a Satisfaction do not exclude the natural Encouragement Sinners have to hope for Mercy upon their Repentance; much less will it overthrow the Demonstration we have of a *future State* from the Consideration of God as the righteous Governor of the World. I don't see indeed how we can well exclude all Hope of Reward for the virtuous, tho' but imperfectly so; but be that as it will; tho' we were able to determine nothing concerning the Exercise of Mercy and Favour towards penitent Sinners; it would nevertheless appear utterly inconsistent, that God should take upon him to be the Governor of rational Creatures, (and are not all Mankind oblig'd to acknowledge him as such?) and yet make no Difference between those who pay a sincere Regard to his Authority, and suffer great Inconveniencies upon that Account; and profligate Sinners who bid Defiance to his Government, and prosper in this World by doing so. But to return,

We have seen in this Way of God's reconciling us to himself, that is to say, by the Death of his Son, a Display of the divine Purity; of God's Abhorrence of Sin; and of the Regard he had to the righteous Sanction of his Law. I need not say what a Manifestation also here is of the Love of God

God to Men. The Scripture is full of this. I would only have it observed, that the Love of God is magnified particularly upon this Account, that God gave Christ *to die for us*. And indeed upon the foregoing Principles it must be own'd, the Love of God was herein carried to the utmost Height possible: It being suppos'd that God saw it requisite that his Son should die in order to our being restor'd to his Favour, what can give a Creature more exalted Apprehensions of the exceeding Riches of divine Goodness, of his Love and Pity to Sinners, than his being willing to give up his only begotten Son rather than that we should perish? that he should *not spare his own Son, but deliver him up for us; deliver him to be made a Curse for us, that we might be delivered from the Curse?* Well might St. John say, *God is Love. Herein is Love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent his Son to be the Propitiation for our Sins.* Can there be imagin'd a more glorious Instance of the divine Philanthropy ('tis a Word St. Paul uses) than this is? The same Consideration raises in us the highest Admiration of the Love of Christ, who *when he was rich, for our Sakes was willing to become poor; was willing to give his Life a Ransom for us; was himself made Sin for us, that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him.* Well might the Apostle speak of a *Length and Breadth, a Height and Depth of the Love of Christ passing Knowledge.*

It hath been already hinted, what vast Encouragement is given, what a strong Foundation is hereby laid, for the Hope of a Sinner under the most afflicting Sense of Guilt, and the most lively Apprehensions of the divine Purity and Justice.

I shall

I shall add but one Thing more, what can be conceived more forcibly to draw the Sinner to Repentance, and persuade him to be reconciled unto God; whether by working upon his Fear or raising his Hope, or exciting Gratitude and Ingenuity? The same Views must influence to Constancy of Obedience, and powerfully constrain to all Readiness in the Service of God and the Redeemer, as long as he lives.

And now to sum up the Matter, if this Way which God hath taken for the reconciling the World to himself, *viz.* by making Christ, his only begotten Son, to be *Sin for us*; If this do indeed present us with such a View of the divine Glory, carrying in it such a perfect Harmony of those Perfections of the divine Nature which seem most opposite in their Tendency and Aspect towards Sinners; giving us an illustrious Display of the divine Purity in his irreconcilable hatred to Sin, and at the same Time opening a Way for the most extensive Exercise of Mercy to Sinners; yea and enhancing both the Mercy and the Justice, being a more glorious Instance of the Love of God, to Men, than if there were no Atonement required, and also a more surprising and affecting Demonstration of the inviolable Regard God hath to the righteous Sanction of his Law, and his Concern for the Honour of his Government, than if the original Sentence had been put in Execution: If this Method of bringing Sinners to God hath the most natural Tendency, and is the most effectually Means to awaken the Sinner to a just Sense of what he hath deserved; and doth at the same Time yield him the strongest Support and Encouragement under the most afflicting Sense of his Guilt and Danger; and carries with it the most powerful Motives to persuade him to be reconciled unto God,

God, and to influence him a willing Obedience for the Time to come: If, I say, in this Method which God hath taken, there is so bright Manifestation of the divine Glory; and so many good and excellent Purposes with respect to us are answer'd by it; all which I think to be very evident; if after all any one shall tell me, this appears to him as a weak and foolish Contrivance; I must conclude, either that he hath not duly considered the Matter; or else, that he hath a Turn of Mind as different from me, as his Sense of seeing must be suppos'd different from mine, who should say, that Snow appears to him to be black.

I shall conclude this Chapter with a short Passage of the late excellent Dr. *Clarke* in his Sermon upon the *Sufferings of Christ*, which I read after that I had wrote my Thoughts as above. There he expresses in a very lively Manner his Sense of these Matters. “ This is that wonderful Composition of Justice and Mercy, which Men and Angels must for ever adore, but can never sufficiently praise and celebrate.

CHAP. V.

The Importance of receiving the Doctrine of our Redemption by Jesus Christ, as set forth in the Gospel.

THE New Testament declares that Christ is the *Mediator between God and Men*; that he offer'd himself a Sacrifice for the Sins of the World: And in consequence of this, God hath set him forth as a *Propitiation through Faith in his Blood*. We are expressly told, that God called him to be an *High-Priest*; and as such he entered into the Holy-place not made with Hands, into Heaven

Heaven itself; not with the Blood of others, but by his own Blood, there to appear in the Presence of God for us; there he ever lives to make Intercession; there he is an Advocate for us with the Father: In Consequence of this, we are directed to *come to God by him*, as the High-priest whom God hath set over his House, to ask in his Name, and by him to offer up the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually. The Declarations of Scripture relating to these things are very express; the Directions very plain; there is all the Appearance in the World that the Writers themselves understood these Things according to the plain literal Sense of the Expressions, and designed that all that read them should so understand them. I conceive that nothing but the Apprehension of some Absurdity in the Things themselves so understood could induce any to put a figurative Sense upon them: But such Apprehension is altogether groundless. I hope what hath been said may satisfy any unprejudiced Person, that these Doctrines are so far from being in themselves absurd, that they carry in them a bright Manifestation of divine Wisdom and Goodness, I would now by way of Conclusion add a few Words concerning the *Importance* of these Doctrines; I mean the Importance with respect to our receiving them.

The strong Consolation they afford, is evident at first sight; they are generally proposed with this View in the New-Testament. But some perhaps could easily dispense with this: They think they don't need such Encouragements; or it may be, don't see any such Encouragement in them; at least nothing but what might as well be had from other Considerations. Be it so: But if God hath seen fit to take this Method for the restoring us to his Favour; we may do well to consider

sider how it may be resented if Men slight it and reject it; if any will take upon them to censure it as absurd and foolish. Put the Case, that an offended Sovereign should make Proclamation of Pardon to a Company of Rebels that lay at his Mercy, and at the same time declared that he had required his only Son to suffer some Indignity as a Token of his Resentment of the heinousness of their Offence, which his Son willingly submitted to for their sakes; and therefore he required of all that desired to receive their Pardon, that they should acknowledge themselves beholden to his Son, and present their Petition by him: If now among these Rebels any should object, "this is a weak foolish Contrivance; no, we can't believe that ever our Prince would give out such a Proclamation;" and upon this Pretence, notwithstanding the most authentic Testimonials, resolve to give no Credit to it; or if they cannot pretend to dispute the Testimonials that are brought, endeavour to evade the plain Meaning of the Words, because it doth not agree with their Notions; what would one expect should be the Consequence? Might they not justly be excluded the Benefit of the Proclamation? Might not their Sovereign justly resent their obstinate Presumption? I doubt not but in such a Case all Men would condemn the Rashness and the Folly. Is it less deserving Censure, when Men reject the Counsel of God against themselves, upon a Pretence that it seems to them a foolish Contrivance, no ways worthy of God? What is this but to add Scorn and Contempt to the slighting his Favour? Surely no one can think it less deserving Censure in this Case, unless it must be said, we are allow'd to make more free with God, than with an earthly Sovereign.

It will be said perhaps, It is not a designed Affront. Be that as it will: I am now considering the Action in itself, what it is in its own Nature. And I find that the Scripture doth sometimes so represent Matters; and without Doubt very justly. There is an intrinsick Evil in Actions, which is a different Consideration from the Intention of the Persons, and indeed entirely distinct. And surely that ought to be of some Weight to excite Caution. Thus it is said, *he that believeth not God maketh him a Liar, because he believeth not the Record that God hath given of his Son.* (1 John v. 10.) I don't suppose, the Apostle design'd to charge any Man with saying in express Words, that *God is a Liar*; or indeed with entertaining such a Thought directly and formally. But a Man's not believing was, in Effect, and by just Consequence, making God a Liar; and so far as a Man is culpable in not believing, he is chargeable with this Crime. Persecuting the Church of God was in St. Paul's Esteem a great Crime; and undoubtedly it is so: How far Ignorance or good Intentions may excuse, or extenuate the Guilt of particular Persons, is of another Consideration. The Thing in its own Nature, or in itself consider'd, will ever be the same, *i. e.* a great Evil. This is the Point we have now under Consideration with respect to the Case before us.

We here suppose it to be *Fact* that God did appoint his Son to offer himself a Sacrifice, that God hath made him High-priest, and doth require of all that come to him that they come by Christ as the High-priest whom he hath set over his House: When these Things have been plainly declar'd, fully promulgated, sufficiently attested, if any shall
object

object and say, "this doth not appear to us a
 " Method becoming the Wisdom of God, and
 " therefore we cannot pay Regard to it; the es-
 " sential Mercy of God is a sufficient Encourage-
 " ment; nay we think it a Disparagement to his
 " Mercy to apply to him by a Mediator; we
 " need not one to intercede for us, we need no
 " High-priest, nor will we be beholden to any to
 " make our Peace with God." Is not this the
 natural Language of rejecting these Doctrines,
 and refusing to acknowledge Christ the Son of God
 as the Propitiation for our Sins, and as the High-
 priest of our Profession? Just in the same Manner
 as the Apostle saith, he that believeth not God,
 maketh him a Liar. So far then is plain, they
 stand charged with these Facts; they do really cen-
 sure the Method God hath taken as weak, foolish
 and absurd; this is the Reason some give for their
 not admitting these Doctrines; they do actually
 refuse to give that Honour to the Son of God,
 which God hath called him to, and which he
 claims for him, *i. e.* God hath *glorified Christ to
 be made an High Priest*; but they will not acknow-
 ledge him in that Character. All I would ask at
 present is, what we must think of such a Censure
 of the divine Counsels, of such refusing to give to
 the Son of God the Honour which God requires us
 to give unto him; whether these are not to be
 reckon'd as being in themselves great Crimes, an
 Affront to the blessed God, and a Slight to the
 Saviour of the World? Is there not the same Jus-
 tice in this as in *St Paul's* ranking himself among
 the chief of Sinners upon account of his persecuting
 the Church? He never mentions that without ex-
 pressing a deep Sense of the Greatness of the Crime,
 and speaks of God's forgiving it, and taking him
 after that to be an Apostle, as one of the highest
 Instances of Mercy, and design'd to be for an En-
 I couragement

couragement to the greatest Offenders. *I was* says he, *a Blasphemer and a Persecutor, and injurious; bowbeit, I obtained Mercy, that in me first Christ might shew forth all long Suffering for a Pattern to them who should hereafter believe on him to everlasting Life.* 1 Tim. i. 12.

It will be replied, it's likely, "aggravate the Thing in itself as much as you please; since it is through Mistake of Judgment, a Person is not answerable for what he cannot help." However, this I hope will be granted me, that censuring the Ways of God as foolish and absurd, that the denying the Honour which God requires to be paid to his Son, are in themselves consider'd evil, and in their own Nature Crimes. A Man's Judgment doth not alter the Nature of Things. Persecuting the Church of God is really a great Evil, an Injury to Men, and a Breach of the divine Law, tho' a Man should imagine that at the same Time he is *doing good Service*; yea rather in that Case so much the greater Evil, inasmuch as he makes God himself the Abettor and Encourager of so great a Wickedness. In this very Instance, which we have seen the Apostle represents as so enormous a Crime, he tells us, that *he verily thought that he ought to do those Things which he did against them that believeth in Jesus.* Acts xxvi. 9, &c. I insist so much on that, because I would have the Evil, in itself consider'd stand clear and distinct from the Consideration of the Consequences it may justly bring upon any one, who may be justly charged with the Thing itself, or be reckon'd guilty of the Fact.

That which remains now, is to consider how far Ignorance or Mistake may excuse from or alleviate the Guilt. I believe no Man will make any doubt but

but that Ignorance and Error when absolutely unavoidable will wholly excuse, be the Action in its own Nature ever so criminal. But will any say, that all Ignorance and all Mistake is without Fault; and consequently will be at all Times a sufficient Excuse for the greatest of Crimes? Certainly we are accountable to God for the Use of our Understanding, as well as for the Use of other Powers and Faculties which God hath endu'd us with: It might perhaps be justly said, our first Obligation as rational Creatures lies there. And I think there is no Man that reflects upon the Actings of his own Mind, but will perceive and must be convinc'd, that there is an Exercising of the Understanding as truly in our Power, (and consequently that we are as properly accountable for the right Use of it) as the Exercise of other Faculties that belong to our Nature. It is true, the Assent of the Mind is not directly and immediately in our Power; a Man can't believe just as he pleases; but every Man is conscious of a Fault, and upon Reflection often blames himself for Rashness in believing in some Cases, or for Obstinacy in not believing in other other Cases. He sees many Times that he hath believ'd without sufficient Reason, or when there was good Reason to the contrary; he sees sometimes that he hath refus'd to give Credit, when there was just Reason for it; and as the Consequences of the one or the other may affect him, he is oftentimes convinced of his having done foolishly; *i. e.* not having attended as he ought to have done, in the one Case or the other; and cannot help regretting his Folly.

If a Man will not attend to the Evidence propos'd in a Matter that concerns him, which is worthy his Regard, and which he ought to consider; if he will indulge any unreasonable Prejudice or corrupt Affection which plainly give a Byass to the

Mind; in such Cases the not admitting the reasonable Evidence is certainly a Fault, and a Man is justly liable to the Consequences. In short, so far as a Man may justly be blam'd for not hearkening to Reason, so far he is answerable for any mistaken Conclusions or wrong Judgment he may form; and that according to the Importance of the Matter about which he is mistaken.

Upon this Occasion I would observe, There are Corruptions of the Mind, as well as Lusts of the Flesh, which have an Influence to darken the Understanding and pervert the Judgment; and the indulging the one may be criminal as well as indulging the other. There is Rashness, Pride, Presumption; sometimes Envy and Hatred; these may byass the Judgment, as well as a Fondness for sensual Pleasures, and the Appetites of the Body. But whatever may be the immediate Occasions of Error; upon the whole nothing is more evident, than that the Exercise of the Understanding is in many Cases under our Direction; and so far we are accountable for Mistakes or for wrong Judgments. Is Bigotry no Crime? Are the uncharitable Censures, the unreasonable Jealousies, which some allow themselves in, no Faults? I think all these have their immediate Residence in the Mind or Judgment. Are Rashness and Presumption and Conceitedness, no Faults? Or can we think that no Man is answerable at any Time either for a foolish Credulity or perverse Obstinacy?

Those who receive the New Testament can't pretend to make a Question of it, whether Infidelity may not be a Crime and expose a Man to Condemnation. There we find the great Author of our Religion tells the *Jews, except ye believe that I am He, ye shall die in your Sins.* He tells his Apostles, when he sent them forth to preach in his
Name

Name Repentance and Remission of Sins, that *be who believed not should be damned*. Yea, and upbraids the Disciples themselves with their Unbelief and Hardness of Heart, *because they believed not them who had seen him after he was risen*. Mark xvi. 14. and because they were so slow of Heart to believe *all that the Prophets had spoken*. Luke xxiv. 25. And by the same Reason, and in the same Manner as a Man is really culpable, and be justly condemned, for not admitting the Evidence of a divine Revelation when sufficiently propos'd; one who receives the Revelation may be culpable and justly condemn'd for not admitting the true Sense of it; *i. e.* for not receiving the Doctrines deliver'd and not observing the Directions therein given, when they are with sufficient Clearness set before him: In this Respect also, or upon this Account, we find our blessed Lord blaming his Disciples, as well as censuring his Enemies. *Mat. xvi. 9.—11. Mark viii. 17. Jobn viii. 43.*

If what we have said is just and true; then the Infidel who will not admit the Gospel Revelation, because he imagines the Doctrines of Christ's Mediation as there represented foolish and absurd, and therefore not worthy of God; and he also who for the same Reason, rejects the Doctrine and refuses to comply with the Demands of the Revelation, putting a forc'd Sense and a wrong Meaning upon it, at the same time that he admits the Evidence of the Revelation; both the one and the other is answerable for the Crime this wrong Judgment carries in it, as before represented, so far forth as they are faulty in making this wrong Judgment. But as to this, I think God is the only proper Judge, who hath a perfect Inspection into every Mind. And I hope none will interpret any Thing I have said concerning the Importance of receiving

the Doctrine I have been pleading for, as an uncharitable condemning such as may have different Sentiments about this or any other Point of Christian Revelation. The Peace and Satisfaction of my own Mind doth not depend upon an absolute Certainty of my being in the right ; but rather on the Consciousness of a sincere Desire and Endeavour to know the Mind of God, and a Readiness to embrace the Truth: being assured, that he who thus *follows Christ who is the Light of the World*, as he himself hath said, *shall not walk in Darkness, but shall have the Light of Life*, i. e. Shall find the Way to eternal Happiness. For the same Reason, where any Person gives Evidence of such sincere Desire to follow Christ as the Light of the World, I am obliged to look upon that Person as a Fellow-Christian, and shall ever be ready to embrace such a one with the Love and Affection that Christians owe to one another ; for without Doubt all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in Sincerity are accepted of him: And I think it high Presumption in any Man to pronounce any Error in Judgment inconsistent with a sincere Love to Christ, where Christ himself hath not declar'd it to be so. However, these Considerations which I have hinted, may be fitly propos'd, I think as proper Motives to make Men wary and cautious, how they reject the Counsel of God against themselves ; and least they be charged with slighting and contemning his Grace, and affronting his Wisdom.

Upon the whole, I must profess, I cannot but look upon these Doctrines ; that *Christ died for us*, and is *the Propitiation for our Sins*, that he is our *High-priest appearing in the Presence of God for us*, in short, that he is *the Mediator between God and Men* in such Manner as hath been represented ; these, I say, I cannot but look upon as main Points of Gospel-

pel-Revelation. I do esteem it an unspeakable Advantage, and am thankful for it, that we have by the Gospel so plain and perfect a System of Duty: But I cannot perswade myself that the Gospel was design'd only to be a *Republication of the Law of Nature*. No Doubt it was wisely, and in great Goodness, so order'd, that we should have this clear and perfect Rule of Duty deliver'd to us by the *Son of God*; certainly it must come with a peculiar Influence, and deserves our special Regard, when God hath been pleas'd *in these last times to speak to us by his Son*: But one would be ready to think, we might have had the Benefit of a perfect Rule of Duty at a much cheaper Rate than such Humiliation as the Son of God submitted to when he took Flesh, and liv'd a Life of Sorrows, and died an accursed Death. I say it again, one can scarce help thinking (so it appears to me) that it was scarce worth while for this glorious Person to have come from Heaven only upon that Errand, and to have gone through what he did merely upon that Account; when some other Messenger might, as to the main Purpose, *i. e.* the giving us a clear and perfect Rule of Duty with sufficient Motives, have done the Business as well. I do own it would ill become us to have indulg'd such Thoughts, if he himself had declar'd that this was the sole End of his being sent into the World. But in Truth we find the contrary. Yea, rather he plainly seems to represent somewhat else as the principal Thing in View when he came into the World; I mean the *giving himself a Ransom*, the making Atonement by his Death; in short, that by his own Obedience and Suffering he might become the Author of eternal Redemption to all them that obey him.

I grant, it is the great Design of the Gospel to recover Men to true Righteousness and Holiness,

this may justly be reckoned the very end of our Redemption ; so it is represented: *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water by the Word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having Spot or Wrinkle or any such Thing, but that it should be holy and without Blemish.* (Eph. v. 25. Col. i. 22. Tit. ii. 14. *cum multis aliis*) But for this Purpose, as appears plainly from those very Passages refer'd to, there was need of somewhat besides a Republication of the Law of Nature. The great Apostle, who so often glories in his being made a Minister of this Dispensation, appears to me to have a Notion of it very different from what some among us seem of late willing to take up with ; some, who I question not are hearty and zealous Friends to Revelation, seem dispos'd to drop the Doctrine of our Redemption by the Blood of Christ, in the genuine proper Sense ; which, to speak freely, is in my Apprehension to give up the main Point of the Gospel-Revelation, the peculiar distinguishing Glory of it.

Such a Republication of the Law of Nature as we have by the Gospel, is doubtless very useful and was highly proper ; this all must acknowledge. But what if I should say, this was a 'Thing the least needed ? 'I he first Thing in the natural Order to be provided for, was the Restoring fallen Man to the Favour of God : This would of Course be every Man's first Concern, when he came to have a just View of the state of his Case ; *i. e.* when he consider'd himself as guilty before God. To what Purpose to lay before the convinced Sinner a perfect Rule of Duty, if he had not Encouragement to expect Pardon of his past Transgressions, and Hope of performing an acceptable Obedience for the

the Time to come? When secur'd of these Points, then indeed a perfect Rule of Duty would be seasonable and desirable. Accordingly the first and main Thing in the Gospel-Revelation is the giving to fallen Creatures this Encouragement: The Apostles were sent forth to preach *Repentance and Remission of Sins in the Name of Christ* among all Nations; *Luke xxiv. 47.* The Gospel, which *St. Paul* gloried in, was the *Manifesting the Righteousness of God without Law, even the Righteousness of God which is by the Faith of Christ*, i.e. how the Sinner might be justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ; whom God hath set forth as a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood. *Rom. iii. 21—25.* It was the Word of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them; having made Christ to be Sin for us that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him. This is properly *ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ* the glad Tidings which the Apostles were to publish to the World. When they had brought Men, by the glad Tidings of Pardon and Life to be obtain'd through Christ, to become his Disciples; then were these Apostles to lay before them the whole of their Duty, *teaching them to observe all Things whatsoever he had commanded them.* Thus did *St. Paul*, when he had preach'd among the Gentiles *Christ the Hope of Glory*; he went on warning every Man, and teaching every Man in all Wisdom; that he might present every Man perfect in Christ Jesus, *Col. i. latter end.*

May this Word of Reconciliation be publish'd to the whole World; and Christ crucified be every where known as the *Power of God and the Wisdom of God.*

this may justly be reckoned the very end of our Redemption ; so it is represented : *Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of Water by the Word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having Spot or Wrinkle or any such Thing, but that it should be holy and without Blemish.* (Eph. v. 25. Col. i. 22. Tit. ii. 14. *cum multis aliis*) But for this Purpose, as appears plainly from those very Passages refer'd to, there was need of somewhat besides a Republication of the Law of Nature. The great Apostle, who so often glories in his being made a Minister of this Dispensation, appears to me to have a Notion of it very different from what some among us seem of late willing to take up with ; some, who I question not are hearty and zealous Friends to Revelation, seem dispos'd to drop the Doctrine of our Redemption by the Blood of Christ, in the genuine proper Sense ; which, to speak freely, is in my Apprehension to give up the main Point of the Gospel-Revelation, the peculiar distinguishing Glory of it.

Such a Republication of the Law of Nature as we have by the Gospel, is doubtless very useful and was highly proper ; this all must acknowledge. But what if I should say, this was a 'Thing the least needed ? 'I he first Thing in the natural Order to be provided for, was the Restoring fallen Man to the Favour of God : This would of Course be every Man's first Concern, when he came to have a just View of the state of his Case ; *i. e.* when he consider'd himself as guilty before God. To what Purpose to lay before the convinced Sinner a perfect Rule of Duty, if he had not Encouragement to expect Pardon of his past Transgressions, and Hope of performing an acceptable Obedience for the

the Time to come? When secur'd of these Points, then indeed a perfect Rule of Duty would be seasonable and desirable. Accordingly the first and main Thing in the Gospel-Revelation is the giving to fallen Creatures this Encouragement: The Apostles were sent forth to preach *Repentance and Remission of Sins in the Name of Christ* among all Nations; *Luke xxiv. 47.* The Gospel, which *St. Paul* gloried in, was the *Manifesting the Righteousness of God without Law, even the Righteousness of God which is by the Faith of Christ*, i.e. how the Sinner might be justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in *Jesus Christ*; whom God hath set forth as a Propitiation through Faith in his Blood. *Rom. iii. 21—25.* It was the Word of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself, not imputing their Trespases unto them; having made Christ to be Sin for us that we might be made the Righteousness of God in him. This is properly *ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ* the glad Tidings which the Apostles were to publish to the World. When they had brought Men, by the glad Tidings of Pardon and Life to be obtain'd through Christ, to become his Disciples; then were these Apostles to lay before them the whole of their Duty, *teaching them to observe all Things whatsoever he had commanded them.* Thus did *St. Paul*, when he had preach'd among the Gentiles *Christ the Hope of Glory*; he went on warning every Man, and teaching every Man in all Wisdom; that he might present every Man perfect in Christ *Jesus*, *Col. i. latter end.*

May this Word of Reconciliation be publish'd to the whole World; and Christ crucified be every where known as the *Power of God and the Wisdom of God.*

Now unto him who bath loved us, and washed us from our Sins in his own BLOOD, and bath made us Kings and Priests unto God and his Father; to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

Worthy art thou, O Lamb of God, to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy BLOOD out of every Kindred and Tongue, and People and Nation, and hast made us unto our God Kings and Priests.

T H E E N D.



A N
E S S A Y

To prove the

Credibility of the Gospel,

F R O M T H E

DOCTRINE of the Efficacy of CHRIST'S
Death for the Redemption of the
World.



ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author of the following Essay, presuming it might tend to elucidate an important Article of our Religion, was willing to take this Opportunity, by a Third Edition of Mr. TOMKINS's *Mediator*, to submit it to the Judgment of the Public. And, while he would acquaint the Public, that it is the Product of his *juvenile* Studies, he hopes his Youth and Inexperience will be accepted as a sufficient Plea for their Candour.

J. T.



A N
E S S A Y

To prove the
Credibility of the Gospel.



TA KING it for granted, “That Repentance alone is not sufficient to procure for us an Indemnity, and to reinstate us in our original State of Purity and Felicity;” and “That, according to the plain and current Language of Scripture, our Redemption and Salvation are owing to the Death and Sufferings of Christ, as their real and meritorious Cause: Taking these Propositions for granted, I would attempt to prove that from this Doctrine we may draw some strong *presumptive* Arguments in Favour of Christianity; and that, on this Account, it is more worthy of Credit as a Divine Revelation. And this will appear (I think) from these Considerations. As,

I. If the Doctrine of Redemption through the Blood of Christ be true, then the *Means* made use of

of well suit the *End*. The Scriptures represent Christ to be the Brightness of his Father's Glory, and the express Image of his Person; as that divine Person, by whom the Father created all Things; as the first-born of every Creature; as the only begotten and best beloved of the Father: They assert that he was in the Beginning with God, and was God; that he was before all Things, and that by him all Things subsist; as transcendently great and glorious, and as possessing peculiar Dignity and Honour with the Father, before the World was. Now if the only or principal End of the Incarnation, Humiliation, and Sufferings of this divine Person, was to instruct us in the Truth, to set us an Example of every divine Virtue, and at length to die for us as a Martyr, what Need was there for a Person of such distinguished Majesty, to bring about these Effects? Could not a Prophet, or an Apostle, or an Angel, have full as well answered these Purposes? Nay, may we not say that the Apostle *Paul*, as a Prophet and Instructor, and Preacher of Righteousness, did more by his Travels, Labors, and Ministrations, to reform the World, and spread the Knowledge of the Truth, than Jesus Christ, considered only as a Prophet and Instructor? And as to our Lord's Death, were not the same Ends promoted by the Deaths of the Confessors and Martyrs, from the Beginning of the World? What Proportion then is there betwixt the Dignity of Christ's Person, and the Efficacy of his Death and Sufferings, designed only as a Testimony to the Truth? But if by his Death he procured eternal Redemption for us, if by his Sufferings he wrought out the Salvation of an innumerable Multitude of intelligent and moral Agents, and restored them to a glorious Immortality, here is an Effect proportional to the Dignity and original Excellency of his Person; then the

Fruits

Fruits of his Death are as great and as immense as his spotless Innocence, and his glorious resemblance of God, and Likeness to him in the Perfections of his Nature; then the Expence of the Means does not exceed the End to be answered by them. And, on this Account, the Christian Plan of Redemption appears more wise, consistent, and uniform, than it does upon the other Scheme, and consequently the Death of Christ, considered as the Foundation of all the Advantages and Blessings we enjoy as Christians, must be, under the Gospel more worthy our esteem, and more worthy the Fountain of Wisdom; and it's Characteristics as celestial and divine, more apparent than they would be, if the Death of our Lord is viewed only in the Light of that of an Exemplar and Martyr.

2. The Doctrine of Redemption, through the Blood of Christ, preserves the Analogy betwixt God's moral Government, as revealed in the Scriptures, and that Part of it we can trace without the Help of Revelation, in this present State and World. Observation and Experience teach us, that the Method of God's Government in this World is by the Mediation, and Agency and Interposition of the various Beings about us, and with whom we may be connected. It seems to be the Design of the divine Being to confer his Benefits and Blessings through the Hands of others; so that universal Love, Benevolence, and Goodness may be promoted; and we may be linked together in mutual Dependence. So one is under God the Means of Health, Peace, and Prosperity to another; our Lives are preserved, our Ruin is prevented, and our Happiness brought about, by some kind Friend and Benefactor: We are indebted to others for almost every Satisfaction, Blessing, Instruction, and Improvement we enjoy: our Knowledge, our Vir-
tue,

tue, our Liberty, and all our Enjoyments, in a lesser or greater Degree, flow to us by the Mediation of others: and our Felicity, in many Cases, depends entirely upon the Interposition of some benevolent Person. As far as we can discover, God's Government is by the Instrumentality and subordinate Agency of others; and that God should thus govern the World in other Instances, of which we have not ocular Proof, seems (to say the least) very probable. And this Point the Christian Revelation seems to put out of Doubt; here is the Discovery made of the Mediation of Jesus Christ and the invaluable and important Blessings flowing from his Interposition to save a lost and perishing World: And our Redemption through his Blood seems to be a noble, grand and considerable Part of the same Plan of the divine Government: and consequently that Revelation, that opens our Prospects and enlarges our Views with the farther and more illustrious Execution of the same Method of the divine Administrations, bids fair to come from Heaven; and as what it reveals in this Respect is consonant to what Experience teaches us; it bears striking Signatures of having God for it's Author; and as this is more illustriously displayed in the Doctrine of the complete and entire Salvation of the penitent Sinner through the Blood of Christ: to *this* Doctrine the Gospel is beholden for an additional Evidence of it's celestial Origin and divine Authority: and on this account it is more credible than it would otherwise be.

3. The Doctrine of Redemption by the Blood of Christ accounts for the *frequent Mention* that is made of the Death of Christ in the New Testament, and for it's being *improved* as the Foundation of every Christian Grace and moral Virtue, and for it's being insisted upon as the most powerful Obligation to

to all Holiness and Goodness. No one who has perused the Writings of the New Testament can be a Stranger to the frequent Mention that is made of the Death of Christ as the most remarkable Instance of the Love of the Father, and the Grace of the Redeemer; as that End for which Christ came into the World; as what the Prophets had in a particular Manner foretold as the characteristic Mark of the Messiah; and as a most cogent Reason for the Exercise of every moral and divine and social Virtue; for Love to God, and Benevolence to Mankind, Humility, Patience, and universal Holiness. And according to the Account we have now given of the Design of the Death of Christ, as the Foundation of our Deliverance and Salvation from Sin and all its penal Effects, we see the propriety of its being thus insisted upon by the Sacred Writers; for then the Doctrine of the Death of Christ is nearly of the same Importance and Influence in the Christian Revelation; as the Belief of the Being and Perfections of God is in natural Religion; and this renders the Gospel consistent, uniform and regular in its several Parts: it preserves an Harmony and Agreement betwixt its grand Doctrines and great Duties, and a Connexion betwixt the Principles and Practice of Religion: this accounts for the Manner of the Apostles writing and their Method of enforcing every Branch of Duty and every Obligation of Reason: Whereas from the Opinion that the Death of Christ was only an Example and as a Testimony to the Truth, it does not appear why the sacred Writers should insist more on the Death of our Lord, and urge that as a more powerful Obligation to Religion and Virtue than the Death of any other Prophet or Martyr. Consequently the former Scheme, as holding up to our view the Beauty, Order, Regularity and Harmony of the Gospel Revelation, must recommend it more to our Esteem, as more likely

likely to come from the Author and Source of Perfection and Beauty, and from the God of Order: and because in a Divine Revelation a Distinction must be made betwixt Things of lesser and greater Importance, betwixt trivial Affairs and momentous Events, it would insist upon those Things chiefly, in which we are more nearly and intimately concerned, and which have the greatest Influence upon our Temper and Conduct.

4. The Death of Christ, as the Ground and Reason of our Pardon and eternal Life, affords a more glorious Display of the Divine Perfections; and therefore this View of the Death of Christ represents the Gospel in a more valuable, important and excellent Light. Our Lord places Eternal Life in the Knowledge of God and of himself, and to form amiable and worthy Conceptions of the Deity is of the utmost Use in begetting a Love of him and proper Affections towards him; and the more consistent and amiable a view any Revelation gives us of God, it's Worth, and genuine Goodness, and true Usefulness are enhanced thereby. And does not the *Wisdom* of God shine forth with peculiar Advantage in the Scheme of Redemption, in bringing so much Good out of, and in causing such an immense Bliss to flow from such an Evil as the Death of his own Son? How evidently does Christ appear to be the *Wisdom* of God and the *Power* of God in the happy Benefits, the transcendently glorious and blessed Consequences of his Obedience to the Death of the Cross? And then as to the *Goodness*, *Mercy*, and *Compassion* of God herein expressed, it passes the Power of Imagination to conceive, or the Force of Language to describe. Whereas if Christ by his Death only set us a Pattern of all Piety, Meekness, Submissiōn and Goodness, or testified the Truth of his

his Mission, our Ideas of the divine *Wisdom* are not so grand and noble; nor can our Sense of the *Love* of God be so striking, lively and affecting; because the Manifestations of it are not so signal and remarkable. Who therefore would not think the Gospel more worthy of his Esteem upon the former than the latter Notion? Does the Evidence of the Truth of the Gospel, from it's internal Characters, increase in proportion, as it's Discoveries of the Perfections of God are more consistent, worthy, and just? Must not the Gospel (upon the Supposition that the Doctrine of our Redemption through the Blood of Christ is a distinguishing Doctrine of it) appear to be more worthy of God, as displaying all his Attributes in the fairest Point of View and reflecting them in the most amiable Light in the Face of Jesus Christ, and in his Undertaking for our everlasting Happiness? Shall we not have Reason to glory in a *crucified* Saviour, as in him are manifested the infinite Wisdom, boundless Goodness, and exceeding Benignity of the Divine Being? Should not these Discoveries of the Perfections of God in the Death of Christ, and the consequent Fruits of it be studied and improved by us, as a blessed Guard against Infidelity, for surely that Religion bids fairest to come from Heaven, which contains the brightest Transcript of the Perfections of him, whose Throne is in the Heavens?

5. And Lastly, This Doctrine of the Redemption of Sinners through the Blood of Christ, best tends to promote the grand and ultimate Design of every Revelation from God, and must therefore give a proportional Authority to the Christian. To renew us again in Righteousness and true Holiness must be the Design of every Discovery of the divine Mind and Will to sinful and depraved Creatures; and to inforce and strengthen our moral Obligations; and so

so to impress our Souls with the Excellency, Importance, and Necessity of Holiness, out of Love and Gratitude, and Interest, as to excite us to the immediate, constant, and unwearied Practice of it, must be its genuine and natural Tendency. And the more any Revelation appears suited to beget in us a Love of Goodness and sincere Piety, so much stronger must be the Presumption in its Favor. How much higher then rises this Evidence of the Truth of Christianity, upon the Supposition of the Truth of the Doctrine of our Salvation through the Sufferings of the Redeemer, than upon the Belief that his Sufferings were to no higher End than those of a Martyr. They then, besides enforcing Integrity and Honesty, Love and Piety, by our Lord's Example, shew us in a striking Manner the evil Nature of Sin, as the wise Governor of the World did not think fit to remit it without the Intervention of Christ's Death: They point out to View the Value and Importance of Holiness in the Sight of God, as it was exhibited in the Death of Christ, the Means of procuring such glorious and immense Blessings for the human Race. They afford us the most powerful and encouraging Motives to Repentance, from the Love of God and the Grace of the Redeemer, and shew us the Necessity of Holiness, as it will secure to us (through the Mediation of Christ, and what he has done for us) true Greatness, Honour, and Felicity, for the Attainment of which we should reckon Nothing too dear, not even Life itself; and they urge us more powerfully than any other abstract Reasoning, to love God and the Saviour, to devote all to the Honour of the Father and the Service of the Son; and, above all Things, to be ambitious, diligent, and zealous, in practising the Instructions and following the Example of our generous Friend, who shed his Blood to do us the
greatest

greatest Service, and to raise us to the greatest Dignity, Honour, and Bliss. And in Consequence, how greatly does a Scheme so well calculated to save at once from the Power and the penal Effects of Sin; a Method of Salvation, by which our Sanctification is strongly urged and recommended, tend to confirm our Faith in the Gospel; to promote our Adherence to it, and to render our Belief of it steady, rational, and effectual, and to produce the Fruits of Righteousness in our Lives and Conversations! How much better is the Gospel upon this Notion adapted to bring about the great Design of every Revelation; and therefore how much more worthy of our Regard and Esteem!

F I N I S.

T. PATTERSON
LONDON
WETTERKENT



